Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-066
Friday
7 April 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-066 *7 April 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gorbachev, Thatcher To Discuss Arms Control *[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 1
Vienna Talks Envoy Cites Need To Be 'Realistic' *[TASS]* 1
Akhromeyev Opposes NATO Nuclear Modernization *[East Berlin ADN]* 2
NATO, Pact Military Doctrines Studied in Budapest *[TASS]* 2
Military Official Stresses Defensive Doctrine *[Paris LE FIGARO 31 Mar]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Yakovlev Briefs Envoys on Election Results *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 5
Romania's Ceausescu Receives Lushev, Lobov *[TASS]* 5
CEMA Socioeconomic Chiefs Meet in Prague *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 5
40th CEMA Science Committee Meeting Concludes *[TASS]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskiy Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 6 Apr 6
Criticizes Fitzwater's Remarks *[TASS]* 6
Denounces U.S. Afghanistan Policy *[TASS]* 6
Updates Afghan Military Situation *[TASS]* 7
Discusses FRG, Namibia, Cambodia *[TASS]* 7
Outlines Lebanese Situation *[TASS]* 7
Zagladin on Common European Home Meeting *[Prague Radio]* 8
40 States Seek Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty *[TASS]* 9
'Farsightedness' Sought in NATO's '5th Decade' *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 9
Western European Union Council Meets in London 10
Conclusions Listed *[Moscow TV]* 10
UK's Howe Comments *[London DAILY TELEGRAPH 4 Apr]* 10
Civil Aviation Protocol Ratification Deposited *[TASS]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States and Canada

Former NATO Commander Reveals Arms Plan *[TASS]* 12
U.S. Policy in Latin America Questioned *[TASS]* 12
U.S. Should Make 'Next Move' on Central America *[Mayorov on Moscow International]* 12
U.S.-Soviet Dialogue on Central America Urged *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 13
Shamir, Mubarak, Husayn Visit U.S. for Talks 13
Shamir News Conference *[TASS]* 13
Talks With Baker *[TASS]* 14
U.S. Appoints Representative to Afghan Rebels *[TASS]* 15
U.S. Diplomacy Contributing to Afghan War *[Malikov on Moscow Radio]* 15

China

PRC Journalists Delegation Continues Visit *[Moscow International]* 16
Journalists Discuss Reform *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 16
Corruption Said 'Impeding Reform' in China *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* 16
China Denies Selling Arms to Iran *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Mar]* 17
Vlasov Receives PRC Provincial Delegation *[Moscow TV]* 17
Kazakhstan, Xinjiang Develop Economic Ties *[Moscow International]* 17

Northeast Asia

FSX Talks Show 'Crack' in U.S.-Japan Relations 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Cambodia *[TASS]* 18
Indochinese Statement on SRV Withdrawal Viewed 19
'Bold,' 'Correct' Step *[Afonin on TASS]* 19
Pullout Offer Hailed *[Lebedev on Moscow International]* 20
Cambodian Beam Reports Statement *[Moscow International]* 21

Near East & South Asia

Military Analyst Views Aircraft Sales to Libya *[Asaturov on Moscow International]* 21
Afghanistan Marks Ramadan With Amnesty, Cease-Fire 21
Terminally Ill Prisoners Freed *[TASS]* 21
Talks With 'Rebels' Sought *[TASS]* 22
Afghan 'Rebel', Indian Sikh Contacts Disclosed 22
Indian MP's 'Troubled' *[TASS]* 22
Gandhi Criticizes Pakistan *[TASS]* 22
2 Pakistanis Sentenced to Jail in Afghanistan *[Moscow TV]* 22
Pakistani Politician Cited on Afghanistan *[TASS]* 23
Afghan Foreign Minister Ends Moscow Visit *[TASS]* 23
Communist Party Delegation Visits Syria 23
Received by Ba'th Party Official *[TASS]* 23
Accord Signed *[TASS]* 23
Shamir's Continued 'Intransigence' Criticized *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopians Begin To Reject Separatism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Mar]* 24

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev London Guildhall Speech 25
Ceremonies Precede Speech 25
British Leaders in Attendance *[TASS]* 26
Gorbachev Speech *[Moscow TV]* 26
Reportage on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meetings 30
Talks Begin *[Moscow TV]* 30
Thatcher Comments After Talks *[TASS]* 30
Gorbachev Comments After Talks *[TASS]* 30
Thatcher Speech at Official Dinner *[TASS]* 31
Gorbachev Speech at Official Dinner *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 33
Gorbachev Tours London, Meets British Leaders 34
Tours British Firm *[TASS]* 34
Meets British Businessmen *[TASS]* 35
Visits Westminister Abbey *[TASS]* 35
Meets Labour Party's Kinnock *[TASS]* 35
Meets Queen Elizabeth *[TASS]* 36
Invites Queen to Visit USSR *[TASS]* 36
Seen Off by Thatcher at Heathrow *[TASS]* 36
Shevardnadze Meets UK's Howe in London *[TASS]* 36
UK-USSR Agreements; Soviets Visit Marx Grave *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 36
Yakovlev Meets UK Members of Parliament *[TASS]* 37
Gerasimov Comments on Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks *[TASS]* 37
Soviet-British Dialogue 'Gaining Momentum' *[TASS]* 38
News Conference Held Prior to Gorbachev Arrival *[Moscow TV]* 39
Gorbachev-Thatcher UK Summit Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 39
London Presummit Mood Reported *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 41

Thatcher's Visit to Africa Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 42
French Defense Minister's USSR Visit Reported 42
Chevenement Shown Backfire Bomber *[AFP]* 42
Military Officials at Chevenement Talks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* 43
Chevenement Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Chevenement Visits Severomorsk Base *[TASS]* 43
FRG Parties Urge Disarmament Steps *[TASS]* 44
'Scandal' in FRG Over Pakistan Nuclear Deals *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 44
KGB Chief Kryuchkov Meets Turkish Ambassador *[TASS]* 45

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Central Committee Member Criticizes Yeltsin *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 46
Yeltsin Rebuts 'Falsification' *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 48
Solovyev Interviewed on Leningrad Election Results
[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Mar] 50
Leningrad Party Committees Review Elections *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 51
Election Lessons, 'Ascent Toward Democracy' Viewed *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 52
Electoral Commission Meets, Reviews Results 4 Apr *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 55
Commission Report Published *[IZVESTIYA 5 Apr]* 56
Moscow's General Kalinin Interviewed on Election Day *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Mar]* 57
Latvia's Vagris Answers Voters' Questions 17 Mar *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 19 Mar]* 59
Ligachev, Baklanov Visit Machine Exhibit 3 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Ligachev, Baklanov Attend 5 Apr Brest Zonal Seminar 61
Leaders Arrive in Brest *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Ligachev Gives Speech at Seminar *[Moscow TV]* 61
Brest Seminar Concludes
Italian Paper Interviews Aleksandr Yakovlev *[Rome L'ESPRESSO 2 Apr]* 61
Latvian Central Committee Decisions Followed Up *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 19 Mar]* 62
More on 13 Mar Latvian International Front Rally *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 22 Mar]* 63
Latvian International Front Newspaper Launched *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 24 Mar]* 64
Latvian Creative Unions Discuss Human Rights *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 64
Latvian Front Petitions for Citizenship Law *[Riga Radio]* 64
Estonia's Ryuytel Speaks on 1949 Deportations *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 24 Mar]* 64
Source of Anonymous Posters in Lithuania Sought *[Vilnius International]* 66
News Conference Held on Ukraine Chernovtsy Illness *[RABOCHAYA GAZETA 23 Feb]* 66
Jewish Culture Society Formed in Moldavia *[TASS]* 66
Volga Germans Seek Rights Within Soviet Union *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 67
New Georgian Party Official Elected *[TASS]* 68
Earthquake Commission Meets in Yerevan 3 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Armenia's Arutyunyan Chairs Reconstruction Meeting *[Yerevan Radio]* 68
Stalinist Views on WWII, German Pact Discussed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 25 Mar]* 68
Deputy Prosecutor Discusses Rising Crime Rate *[PRAVDA 24 Mar]* 72
Construction of Krasnodarskaya Atomic Plant Halted
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Mar] 74
Return of Koran Manuscript to Moslems Discussed
[LITERATRURNAYA GAZETA 29 Mar] 74

Scientific

'Cosmos 2017' Satellite Launched 6 Apr *[TASS]* 75
Effort to Salvage 'Phobos' Mission Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Apr]* 75

Gorbachev, Thatcher To Discuss Arms Control

PM0504154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "On the London Talks"]

[Text] The future of Europe, and consequently the general course of world events, depends to a considerable extent on the nature of Soviet-British relations and what the level of mutual understanding and cooperation between Moscow and London will be. This determines the importance of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Britain and his talks with M. Thatcher.

There is no doubt that arms limitation in Europe will occupy one of the main places in the upcoming talks. The first round of the Vienna talks has shown that despite the existence of "little tricks" in the positions of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, both sides are sufficiently serious. That inspires hope.

It is already clear that factors and circumstances beyond the framework of the Vienna mandate will have the effect of braking the Eurotalks. And it is the present British Government which is keeping its hand firmly on these brakes.

I have in mind primarily tactical nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is prepared to eliminate them, prepared for a "third zero option." NATO objects. The main argument is not distinguished by its novelty—the need for a nuclear deterrent in the face of the "Soviet threat." In the old system of political coordinates—NATO afraid of an attack from the East and the Warsaw Pact afraid of an attack from the West—this argument could be understood. But Moscow is now proposing a new system of coordinates, saying let's proceed from the premise that neither NATO nor the Warsaw Pact intends to attack the other; let's bring the level and composition of arms and strategic doctrines into line with this thesis.

Unfortunately, NATO (so far?) is not ready for this decision. Moreover, Washington and London are insisting on modernizing the tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. In particular, there are plans to increase the range of the "Lance" missiles from 100 to 480 km. Far from everyone in Western Europe is enthusiastic about that. For the time being, it is being written, a compromise has been reached: The new missiles will be developed but their deployment is being put off indefinitely.

In addition, the Americans are insisting on replacing the free-fall bombs, with which the F-111 bombers based in Britain are equipped, with air-to-surface missiles. The British newspaper THE GUARDIAN reports that in addition to the 144 aircraft of this type, London agrees to accept another 60 U.S. bombers at British bases.

Formally all this has nothing to do with the Vienna talks. But it can hardly be asserted that the buildup of the nuclear potential in West Europe will promote the reduction of conventional arms.

I also have in mind the constant attempts to switch to a new generation of "intelligent" conventional armaments, to create weapons of mass annihilation based on new principles (beam, microwave, radiological, infrasonic weapons, and so forth). Disarmament is the means; the end is security. So what security can we talk of if new, even deadlier weapons are deployed in place of the weapons which are reduced? It seems to me that we must put before NATO again and again even more persistently than before the question of halting the qualitative arms race. Otherwise disarmament talks lose their point and become exercises in deception and self-deception.

I have in mind, finally, the tendency that has clearly emerged toward West Europe's military integration. Self-assertion? Perhaps. But by what means? If the West European alliance wants to serve as an example of "nonaggressive defense" that is one thing. But if we have before us a continuation of the traditional strong-arm policy citing the same old Soviet threat, then that is a completely different matter. The creation of a kind of NATO regional subsystem would run counter to the opportunities that have appeared for reducing the pitch of military-political confrontation in Europe and thus creating conditions for overcoming the splitting of the continent.

Formally there is no connection with the Vienna talks here either. But essentially there is undoubtedly a connection. Steps toward West Europe's military integration will not promote growth in the Warsaw Pact's interest in arms reduction, to put it more strongly.

As has already been said, Britain has quite tough positions on all the points listed. But times are changing, and positions are also changing, often belatedly. At any rate, there will be a substantive talk. And the work that awaits M.S. Gorbachev in London can in no way be categorized as easy.

Vienna Talks Envoy Cites Need To Be 'Realistic'

LD0604184589 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—"A search for common denominators, compromises and for a consensus on the most complicated problems is necessary and unavoidable. The Vienna meeting would not be successful without it", Yuriy Kashlev, ambassador at large and head of the Soviet delegation to this forum, writes in the latest issue of the magazine "INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS".

What decisions, reached in Vienna, could be expected, in the opinion of the Soviet diplomat, to yield positive results for Europe and the world first and foremost?

The decision to launch two parallel and interconnected military negotiations—on confidence-building measures in Europe among 35 countries and on the reduction of conventioanl armaments and forces from the Atlantic to the Urals among 23 countries—not only fills the Helsinki process with a genuine disarmament content for the first time, but produces a unique mechanism for practically reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe, Yuriy Kashlev stresses. It is now important, he writes, to conduct the negotiations from realistic positions, to aim them at achieving concrete results not in the distant, but in the closest future.

It is necessary to fix in the practice of all-European relations the genuine "breakthrough" in the humanitarian-legal sphere, achieved in Vienna, to promote and impart concrete content to the concept of "human dimensions of the CSCE process", the Soviet diplomat believes. The created mechanism of international cooperation in this field, envisaging measures both at bilateral and multilateral levels among the parties to the talks, including a three-phase conference on human rights and humanitarian contacts to be held in Paris (1989), in Copenhagen (1990) and in Moscow (1991), should function smoothly.

The unprecedented program of subsequent measures agreed upon in Vienna—eleven talks, conferences, forums within the next three years—should provide a concrete agenda for all-European cooperation, for launching practical efforts to build up a common European home, an idea which is gradually making headway, Yuriy Kashlev stresses.

Akhromeyev Opposes NATO Nuclear Modernization
LD0604125189 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1056 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The alleged military superiority of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact over NATO is a "myth of Western propaganda which has been affecting the consciousness of people in the United States and Western Europe," Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev, marshal of the Soviet Union and adviser to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, said in an interview with the GDR's FREIE WELT. "The size of the forces of both sides in Europe has been published in the 30 January statement by the Warsaw Pact defense ministers. Their study makes it clear that approximate military parity exists."

Akhromeyev described the intention of the NATO states to modernize their nuclear weapons as being completely unreasonable. In view of the high number of tactical nuclear weapons in existence in Europe, it is not a matter of "enlarging these weapons arsenals but rather reducing them. We, the Warsaw Pact, are in favor of the complete liquidation of these weapons. However, if NATO does not agree to their complete elimination, then negotiations must be held on reducing these weapons but not on their modernization."

Marshal Akhromeyev went on to say: "Guided by a defensive military doctrine, we are of course perfecting the organization of our forces in this spirit and are first changing the structure of forces by solving defensive tasks. Therefore, in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany (and as far as I know in the GDR Army), the structure of general divisions will be changed over the next few years. The number of their tanks as means of attack will be reduced while the number of their antitank weapons will be increased."

"Let it also be said, however, that the West, too, must deal with this, for the structure of the U.S. troops based in the FRG, of the Bundeswehr, and that of Great Britain's forces has so far had an offensive character. They also have at their disposal a very large number of tanks and means of building pontoon bridges. The U.S. and NATO naval forces have an offensive character. For this reason, we expect that their structure will also be changed and will be directed toward accomplishing defensive tasks."

NATO, Pact Military Doctrines Studied in Budapest
LD0604091989 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Budapest April 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Sergey Ivanov:

Topical problems arising from a change in the character of NATO and Warsaw Treaty military doctrines have been discussed at an international scientific conference held here. It was attended by scientists, political scientists and military specialists from ten European countries, and also from the United States.

The conference was held with the assistance of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' Peace Research Centre.

Experts from different countries stated that new political thinking has led to a weakening of threat perceptions, which were previously engendered by the character of the military doctrines of the two opposing blocs.

Active development of direct contacts between NATO and Warsaw Treaty citizens will play a major role in completely destroying enemy images. The sides have now agreed that a revision of the character of the military doctrines—making them defensive, not offensive—will be to the benefit of mankind and help strengthen peace and build confidence.

The participants in the conference agreed to continue studying various aspects of NATO-Warsaw Treaty relations and to regularly publish the results of such studies.

Military Official Stresses Defensive Doctrine

PM0504103489 Paris LE FIGARO in French 31 Mar 89 p 4

[Interview with General Yuriy Lebedev, Soviet deputy chief of the General Staff for the Treaty and Legal Directorate, by Pierre Darcourt in Moscow—date not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[passage omitted] [Darcourt] General, some Western countries stress the risk of a surprise attack and think that the Red Army still has an offensive posture.

[Lebedev] Listen, the change of doctrine by the Warsaw Pact forces adopted in 1987 rules out any operation of an offensive nature. This is a major change of attitude.

Henceforth, the main task of our armed forces is to prevent a military intervention. It is with this purpose that we are restructuring our forces. To convince those who are skeptical and distrustful, we decided to make a unilateral reduction in our forces last December: 500,000 men, 8,500 guns, 10,000 tanks, including 5,300 in the East European countries.

[Darcourt] Some experts think that the cutback in your Army and the reduction in an excessively heavy logistical force will give you a more flexible and coherent military tool which will be more efficient.

[Lebedev] The argument does not hold water. I have already heard it and read it. If I follow that argument, we ought to expand the Red Army and swell its ranks to reassure the West. The armored divisions, the airborne brigades, and the engineering regiments with their bridging systems are excellent frontline units. I would like to point out one detail: We are not only scrapping old T-55 tanks but also T-72 tanks.

[Darcourt] General, you are well aware of the French doctrine of nuclear deterrence on which our independence is based....

[Lebedev] Of course...in theory. Under General de Gaulle, the doctrine was based on defense on all fronts. Today there is only one front—Eastern Europe. And, according to our information, the French General Staff regards the USSR as the main enemy. In 1966, France left NATO, but in practice the links remained. To give you an example, your armed forces are deployed with a view to engagement in Germany. NATO uses French infrastructures—communications, radar, logistics, port installations, pipelines. Combined maneuvers are on the increase. And around 30 joint projects for weapons systems are in progress, including the Franco-German helicopter project.

[Darcourt] The mandate for the Vienna disarmament conference was approved by all the participants. However, as soon as the talks started, you raised the question of naval parity between the two alliances although it is a question which was excluded from the said mandate.

[Lebedev] Raising that question did not hamper the negotiations. You know, during the different discussions, I heard several U.S. officers tell me that since the United States was founded God had granted it naval superiority and that it had no reason for abandoning it. Its aircraft carriers are daunting platforms for exercising its power at sea and on land. We Soviets only have aircraft-carrying cruisers intended to protect squadrons. And, despite frequent reports in specialized Western publications, the "Tblisi" which is now under construction, will not be a conventional catapault-type aircraft carrier. Preliminary talks are continuing. Discussions on air forces are also included. We have made provision for a reduction of 800 fighter planes, including the very modern Sukhoy-24 planes. The Western countries wanted to exclude attack aircraft—a sphere in which they enjoy a marked superiority. But we finally obtained agreement on including this point on the agenda. In the second phase of the negotiations, we intend to repeat our request that naval forces be included in the assessment of the balance of forces.

[Darcourt] Is the creation of a Franco-German brigade a strengthening of the Western defense system in your eyes?

[Lebedev] That is obvious. We understand the approach. French policy is aimed at greater independence from the United States. It wishes to speed up the construction of the "common European home." But what worries us is the strengthening of the military potential of European armed forces by the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons, including the Hades missiles of course. This is the short-term way of circumventing the Washington treaty. I think that the French military leadership is still living with the fixed idea that your country's security can only be guaranteed by its deterrent weapons. However, the United States and the USSR have recognized the inefficiency of resorting to nuclear war.

[Darcourt] Your economy can no longer tolerate the proportion of your budget—16 percent of GNP—allocated to the armed forces. And the Soviet authorities promised to publish your budget in full....

[Lebedev] We are aware of our people's urgent needs. As regards the budget, we are facing a problem of price definition. But the Supreme Soviet has decided to speed up the work and we will publish the figures within 3 months. But I can give you indications about the real upheaval in military production. Defense Industry Minister Pavel Finogenov announced yesterday that 50 percent of military factories were being converted to civilian production. Since the abandonment of short- and medium-range missiles, the Barrikady factory in Volgograd

has been mass producing giant tankers for the transportation of milk and yoghurt. The Volfkinsk [name as published] factory, which manufactured tactical nuclear weapons, will work for the national economy, producing machine tools, digital control systems, domestic electrical appliances...and baby strollers.

In Petropavlovsk, the factory manufacturing missile launching pads is now producing washing machines, fridges, and televisions. Others which produced tanks will manufacture tractors, harvesting combines, heavy containers, and food cans. Two years before the agreement, 345 arms factories had already moved over into different types of production, most of them producing agricultural and food processing equipment.

And this change is irreversible. One significant detail is the fact that the Soviet Union has signed a joint venture agreement with the West German company Liebherr, which specializes in hydraulic scoops for turning SS-20 nuclear missile tractors into high-tonnage cranes, with a bearing load of 10 tonnes at the end of their jib. The factory is in Odessa.

[Darcourt] General, what lesson have you learned from your defeat in Afghanistan?

[Lebedev] The first point is that we did not intervene to win, but to help a country which had undergone a revolution and which had signed an agreement with us. We acted at the Afghan Government's request. However, we made two mistakes. The main one is that we did not decide to protect the borders. The war, fueled from outside, very quickly covered the whole territory. There was also very strict censorship. There was no glasnost. The Soviet soldiers suffered as a result of that. They had to remain silent, say nothing when they returned home; they ought to have been welcomed as heroes....but they were hidden. Another mistake was that we failed to take account of ethnic diversity and the strength of religious feeling in Afghanistan.

Yakovlev Briefs Envoys on Election Results
PM3103122989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report entitled "Convincing Evidence"]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, met here on Thursday [30 March] with heads of diplomatic missions of a number of socialist countries accredited in Moscow.

Yakovlev informed them of some political results of the recent elections of people's deputies. They were convincing evidence of support for the restructuring program put forward by the Soviet Communist Party, and considerable activity by the electorate in the democratic processes taking place in the country under conditions of open discussion of various problems, comparison of viewpoints, and the working out of novel solutions. At the same time, the electoral campaign revealed the uneven character of the development of restructuring processes in various regions and the passivity of some party organizations.

On the whole, the democracy model proposed by the party demonstrated its viability and showed that it could ensure the broadest possible basis for people's power.

The following took part in the meeting: Ambassadors G. Koenig of the GDR, Kwan Hui-kyong of the DPRK, Hor Nam Hong of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Khamphong Phanvongsa of Laos, Ts. Gurbadam of Mongolia, and I. Bucur of Romania; Charges d'Affaires F. Spasov of Bulgaria, J. Barabas of Hungary, R. Mirabel of Cuba, J. Smolinski of Poland, and P. Kubasek of the CSSR; and Dang Duc Khoi, counselor envoy of the SRV.

Romania's Ceausescu Receives Lushev, Lobov
LD0404201789 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 4 Apr 89

[Text] Bucharest April 4 TASS—Romanian leader Nicolae Ceausescu received on Tuesday Army General Pyotr Lushev, USSR first deputy defence minister and commander of the allied armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty member states, and Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the allied armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

A conversation held in a warm and comradely atmosphere was attended by Colonel General Vasile Milea, Romanian national defence minister, and Major General Stefan Gusa, first deputy defence minister and head of the General Staff.

CEMA Socioeconomic Chiefs Meet in Prague
PM0704101189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conference in Prague"]

[Text] Prague, 5 Apr—A conference of the chiefs of the Central Committee socioeconomic departments of the fraternal parties of CEMA countries has been held here. They discussed the principles of party policy during the further deepening of socialist economic integration and also progress in implementing the tasks determined by the Prague working meeting involving the Central Committee secretaries of the CEMA countries' fraternal parties. The session, RUDE PRAVO, the organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ], pointed out, took place in a friendly atmosphere amid a frank exchange of opinions.

The participants in the conference were received by J. Lenart, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

40th CEMA Science Committee Meeting Concludes
LD3103131189 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Further implementation of the complex programme to promote the scientific and technological progress of members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) [CEMA] has been discussed at the 40th meeting of the CMEA committee for science and technolgy which ended here today.

It [words indistinct] that work was being carried on under the above-said programme on twelve hundred new types of machinery, technology, materials and bioproducts. A considerable number of them are now at the stage of experimental and industrial production. The CMEA countries have set up more than eighty joint enterprises, scientific research centres, laboratories and designing bureaus. A total of some six thousand organisations of CMEA countries and Yugoslavia are taking part in the realisation of the programme.

The meeting discussed progress made in the programme's priority direction—"acceleration of the development of bio-technologies." It also focussed on the coordination of the national economic plans of CMEA states in science and technology for 1991-1995, on the implementation of comprehensive programmes for the multilateral cooperation of European CMEA countries with Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia.

Gremitskiy Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 6 Apr

Criticizes Fitzwater's Remarks

LD0604145389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1409 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—The mass media and statesmen from European, Asian and Latin American countries highly appraise Mikhal Gorbachev's speech in Havana and, in particular, the parts of the speech pertaining to the USSR's attitude toward a Central American settlement. Yuriy Gremitskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, stated at a briefing.

"Against this backdrop a discordant note was sounded by the statement of White House Spokesman Marlin Fitzwater who, evidently, failed to carefully analyze those parts of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech which clearly reflect the new political thinking of the Soviet leadership and a new approach toward settling the pressing international and regional problems, Yuriy Gremitskiy said. Fitzwater even expressed disappointment with what, in his view, is the USSR's insufficiently clearly defined postion on a Central American settlement."

In this context the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman recalled that the Soviet leader's speech says that the USSR is in favor of solving the problems of Central America on the basis of a balance of interests of all concerned parties and without any outside interference whatsoever. Mutual restraint and strengthening of trust among the states in the region assume paramount importance. This question, in the opinion of the Soviet and Cuban leaders, can be solved by political means alone. The statement stresses that there is now a real opportunity of safeguarding peace and security in the region. Cessation of military deliveries to Central America, irrespective of the quarter from which they emanate, represents one of the most important conditions for this. "It is difficult to be more precise," Yuriy Gremitskiy added.

Denounces U.S. Afghanistan Policy

LD0604150289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1358 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—The chief cause of the further exacerbation of the situation in Afghanistan is the interference from outside in its internal affairs, which is being perpetrated in violation of the Geneva agreements and which has increased of late, Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, stated at a briefing today.

It is particularly lamentable that as before, the United States, a state which is a guarantor of the Geneva agreements, is taking an active part in this interference alongside Pakistan. Via the territory of Pakistan, the United States is giving immense military assistance to the Afghan rebels, including the most up-to-date weaponry. Washington talks a lot about adherence to the political settlement of the Afghan conflict, but the fact that the United States—together with the "hawks" in Islamabad—is not letting the flame of internecine war go out, is hampering dialogue between Afghans, is working toward the overthrow of the legitimate government of the country, and is trying to prevent the United Nations from exerting a constructive influence on the situation within and around Afghanistan.

Yuriy Gremitskiy stressed that not one of the specific and realistic proposals aimed at a cease-fire and at ending the deliveries of arms to the groups fighting each other, aimed at organizing dialogue between Afghans which would allow a representative government on a broad basis to be formed, and aimed at convening an international conference and at other contacts between interested parties, has thus far met with a positive response from the U.S. leadership. What is more, recently a draft resolution was submitted to the U.S. Congress calling for the overthrow of the government of the Republic of Afghanistan and an increase in assistance to the Afghan opposition.

The lawless nature of the so-called provisional government, set up by the "Alliance of Seven," and the fact that its establishment contradicts the spirit and letter of Geneva, have been spoken about more than once, the Soviet spokesman said. And now, the United States, evidently realizing the full offensiveness of its recognition of the transitional government, is making circuitous maneuvers. Plans are being worked out to break off official relations with the government of the Republic of Afghanistan and for the appointment of a special U.S. representative at the rank of ambassador to the mujahadin. It is as if the rebels are being urged on to new military ventures and seizures of territory through the putting forward of "criteria" which enable Washington to recognize de jure the "government of imposters" from Peshawar.

One would think that the failure of the opposition's plans for an easy military victory following the withdrawal of Soviet troops should have led U.S. politicians to reappraise their clearly unrealistic and unconstructive policy with regard to Afghanistan. However, there is still no evidence of this, Yuriy Gremitskiy stated. The world community has pinned serious hopes on the signing of the Geneva agreements, seeing them as an example of how other regional conflicts can and should be resolved. But the actions of the United States undermine confidence in their statements about their readiness to fulfill their obligations which follow from the Geneva agreements.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated, "The sooner the U.S. side reviews its present approach to Afghan affairs, which is destablizing the regional and international situation, and brings it into line with the new and reassuring trends prevalent in world affairs, the better things will be for Afghanistan and for the cause of peace and for ensuring the legitimate national interests of the United States itself."

Updates Afghan Military Situation

LD0604161289 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Afghan Armed Forces caried out air, rocket and artillery attacks on April 5 to thwart the attempts by Afghan extremists and Pakistani malishis to stage a fresh attack on Jalalabad, Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a news briefing on Thursday.

There is information indicating that the rebels have acquired missiles with enhanced range of up to 50-60 km and increased the number of mobile rocket launchers, he said. Foreign military advisers and Pakistani malishis and servicemen continue to take an active part in combat operations near Jalalabad.

Pakistan's growing interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan has caused a public outcry in Pakistan as well, the Soviet spokesman continued. "Abdul Wali Khan, chairman of the People's National Party [as received], recently criticised Islamabad's anti-Afghan policy. He was supported by 30 members of the Supreme Court in Lahore, who condemned Islamabad's interference in the Afghan internal affairs and issued a statement saying that the Pakistani authorities were endangering their own people and democracy in the country by tiptoeing the U.S. line. They demanded unconditional observance of the Geneva accords.

On April 5 the Afghan armed opposition committed another bloody crime, shelling some districts of Kabul. As a result of this inhumane action, nine people were killed and 33 wounded. Theree were women and children among the victims, Yuriy Gremitskiy said.

On April 6, proceeding from the principles of humanity and respect for Islam, the high military command of Afghanistan declared a ceasefire during the Ramadan month. The command urged the commanders of anti-government troops to take advantage of the ceasefire and start negotiations. It said it would not allow the ceasefire to be used for terrorist acts and subversion. The armed opposition rejected that proposal showing once again that it uses Islam as a screen for anti-popular actions.

Discusses FRG, Namibia, Cambodia

LD0604170589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1607 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow 6 Apr (TASS)—The mass news media and statesmen of Europe, Asia, and Latin America are commenting favorably on Mikhail Gorbachev's Havana speech, Yuriy Gremitskiy, a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman, said today at a briefing. Special attention is being paid to the points in the speech that confirm the USSR's consistent policy of creating a healthier international situation and settling regional conflicts, especially in Central America.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the 17th session of the USSR-FRG commission on economic and scientific-technical cooperation opened today in Bonn. The Soviet delegation is headed by Ivan Silayev, a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. In the course of the session's work it is planned to discuss the state and prospects of commercial and economic cooperation between the USSR and FRG on projects including utilization of the natural resources of the Kola Peninsula, the building of petrochemical complexes based on the deposits in western Siberia, and the training of specialists and leading cadres of the economy. Talks are scheduled between Ivan Silayev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl and FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

According to a report by an FRG official government spokesman, Yuriy Gremitskiy said, on 17 April Helmut Kohl will also have a meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze, the USSR foreign minister, and on 18 April with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. "We would like to confirm the importance of the upcoming meetings between the Soviet and FRG leaders and share the optimism of the West German side with regard to the scale and intensity of the prepartion work for the summit meeting 12 to 15 June," said Yuriy Gremitskiy.

Speaking on the situation in Namibia, where the most serious armed clashes in 23 years are continuing for the sixth day in the north, Yuriy Gremitskiy noted that judging by the statements, all sides involved in the Namibian settlement are striving for the fastest possible normalization of the situation. They see the way out of the situation in particular in an immediate deployment in Namibia of a military contingent of the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG). The USSR considers it necessary to obtain the immediate end to bloodshed and expresses hope that by way of joint efforts the conflict will be extinguished.

Commenting on the joint statement by the governments of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and the Laos People's Democratic Republic regarding the completion of the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia by the end of September this year, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman commented that the Soviet side fully supports the new initiative of the Indochinese states toward resolving the Cambodian problem by political means. A detailed assessment will be issued in a USSR Foreign Ministry statement in the near future.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman also briefed journalists on the situation in Afghanistan, and issued a statement condemning American interference in the internal affairs of that country.

Outlines Lebanese Situation

LD0604164189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—The situation in Lebanon, which has been sharply aggravated, was discussed

during a conversation on 5 April between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, first deputy USSR foreign minister, and Mahmud Hammud, Lebanese ambassador in Moscow, stated Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, at a briefing today for Soviet and foreign newsmen.

Deep concern was expressed by the Soviet side on the extremely dangerous development of events in Lebanon. It was noted that in such conditions it is necessary to immediately stop the clashes and shelling which have caused great human casualties. Only genuine dialogue can lead to the restoration of national harmony in that country. The Soviet Union calls upon all Lebanese to display the highest responsibility for the destiny of their homeland and to enter into a joint search for a settlement to the crisis on the basis of the balanced interests of all Lebanese communities. Only the rejection of forceful methods will testify to a sincerity of intent and of statements on an aspiration to preserve the unity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

The Soviet Union is maintaining active contacts with various parties, including the UN secretary general and the "Committee of Six" of the League of Arab States, contacts which have come out of a desire to promote an immediate end to the bloodshed in Lebanon, Yuriy Gremitskiy stressed. The USSR consistently adocates the preservation of that Arab country as a united, sovereign, and territorially integral state, and fully supports the peacemaking efforts of the committee and urges all to foster the success of its mission.

Yesterday Aleskandr Bessmertnykh also received Yves Pagniez, the ambassador of France to the USSR, at the latter's request. During the conversation, the discussion of the situation forming in Lebanon and around it was continued, including opportunities for a settlement in that country.

Zagladin on Common European Home Meeting

LD0104194389 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 1 Apr 89

[From the "Magazine Program," Zagladin remarks recorded, in Russian with superimposed Czech paraphrase]

[Text] One of those taking part in the international colloquium, Common European Home—Notions and Prospects, in Prague is Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and an adviser to the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. David Stahlavsky will now report on his conversation today with journalists accredited at this important international undertaking:

[Stahlavsky] First of all, I asked Comrade Zagladin how he sees the specifics of similar international undertakings such as the international colloquium in Prague. The Soviet guest replied:

[Zagladin] During the past 5 to 6 years I have attended a number of similar seminars. In my view each of them has been a step forward. The important thing is, in particular, that representatives of various political parties and forces from individual countries are able to meet at them. I see progress also in that, while a few years ago we would be accusing each other, today we are examining problems far more soberly and more deliberately. Simply, political thinking has changed in Europe and has contributed to our continent developing as a single whole. And this is a totally new and positive moment.

[Stahlavsky] As the very title, Common European Home—Notions and Prospects, indicates, the debate at the colloquium in Prague is above all about the realization of the idea voiced for the first time 2 years ago during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Prague. Thus the journalists present at the brief informal conversation with Comrade Zagladin asked what in his view is preventing the creation of a common European home. Vadim Zagladin had this to say:

[Zagladin] I believe that two processes are currently going on in Europe. One, which is an all-European one, is concentrated on the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. At the present time this is centered on the implementation of the documents adopted at the follow-up meeting in Vienna. This has very significantly and positively changed the political climate and psychological atmosphere. It also reflects changes in world politics such as a reduction of tension, the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the development of economic and cultural relations, and progress in the tackling of humanitarian issues. Then there is a process that we could term a confrontational one. Although it is not as powerful as before, despite this it manifests itself, especially in the West, in the plans for modernization of tactical nuclear and conventional weapons and in new military projects. These two processes, that is the all-European and the confrontational one, contradict each other. The principal question is which of them will triumph. How to tackle these problems? In my view, Comrade Zagladin went on to say, above all by the consistant building of the common European home. Only in this way will it be possible to weaken confrontation.

[Stahlavsky] Which of the problems contained in the idea to create a common European home has to be tackled first was my final question for Vadim Zagladin.

[Zagladin] The principal question is that of security. Tackling it directly conditions the other ones. But, there exists naturally a whole number of problems—outside Europe as well—the solution of which cannot be delayed any longer. Above all is the ecology. The proposal put forward by your Premier Ladislav Adamec to convene in Prague a meeting of the prime ministers of neighboring countries on the problem of the environment in central Europe is well-known. Others concern, for instance, the

North or the Balkans. We are, of course, worried by other issues: energy resources, drug abuse, terrorism, AIDS. Although the problem of disarmament takes priority, one cannot restrict oneself to it alone. It is necessary to simultaneously tackle all new problems.

40 States Seek Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

LD0604101289 Moscow TASS in English 0823 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] New York April 6 TASS—The permanent representatives of Mexico, Indonesia, Venezuela, Peru, Sri Lanka, and Yugoslavia to the United Nations on Wednesday sent a letter to U.N. secretary-general informing him that 40 signatory nations to the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater ask to convene, in line with the text of this treaty, a conference with the view to turning it into a comprehensive test ban treaty.

At a news conference held at the U.N. Headquarters the authors of the letter and the international organisation, Parliamentarians' Global Action for Disarmament, Development and World Reform, jointly stated that this action would be an important step in removing the threat of a nuclear war and would introduce the necessary multilateral component to the bilateral process of disarmament and talks between the USSR and the United States.

The accession of already 40 states to this demand reflects the will of the whole of mankind which favours a ban on nuclear tests by all, everywhere and for good, said Alfonso Garcia Robles (Mexico), laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize. The U.N. General Assembly also views this goal as a matter of priority, he said. In a TASS interview he noted that a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests would be a component of the process to create a nuclear weapons-free world by the year 2000, which was proposed by the Soviet Union. This goal is a need rather than an utopia, since mankind inexorably faces the choice of whether to live in the world without nuclear weapons or not to live at all.

Participants in the news conference noted that under the terms of the 1963 Moscow treaty, the convocation of a conference to make amendments to it requires the consent of one third of the signatory nations. This number now stands at 39. Making amendments to the treaty requires a two thirds majority. Therefore, there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the international community will declare for extending the treaty in favour of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests.

But the enforcement of these amendments will require the ratification of the changes by the three depository states—the USSR, the United States and Britain.

We have no doubts whatsoever concerning the approach to this issue by one of the depositories. The USSR will say 'yes', Alfonso Garcia Robles said. Therefore, there is an important task before the international community to get a positive response to the demands by the majority of mankind from the two other nuclear countries which are depositories of this treaty.

'Farsightedness' Sought in NATO's '5th Decade'

PM0604100989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Viewpoint" article: "What Is on the 'Birthday Cake'"]

[Text] It is NATO's anniversary. It is 40 years old on 4 April.

Exactly 40 years ago the leaders of 12 Western countries signed a document in Washington setting up a military-political alliance designed, in their words, to counteract the "Soviet threat." During this period the "threat" has not materialized, but NATO is not particularly sorry about that. On the contrary, they even use it to claim that it is the now-16 NATO members' cohesion and determination to rebuff outsiders that has helped keep the peace in Europe all these years.

Although wars big and small have repeatedly broken out, peace in Europe has indeed been preserved. But is that largely thanks to NATO? And just how lasting, stable, and reliable is a peace based on mountains of weapons whose accumulation in Europe has been so assiduously promoted by the Atlanticists? There are many arguments to show that peace has been preserved not so much thanks to as in spite of NATO efforts. However, we will not darken somebody else's anniversary; we will put rhetoric to one side and try to take an objective view of the role that the NATO alliance could play in international life.

Incidentally, this was the task set by the participants in the representative conference held in Brussels the other day devoted to the NATO anniversary. The changes currently taking place in East-West relations, they noted, require NATO to review the very nature of the alliance. According to NATO Secretary General M. Woerner, the bloc should be transformed into a kind of buttress for the "forces of change." Belgian External Relations Minister L. Tindemans called for promotion of "the USSR's transformation from an opponent into a long-term, reliable partner." There were also calls for the easing of international tension....

But strangely, while calling for improved relations with the socialist countries, the Atlanticists have been in no hurry to reinforce this improvement through specific bloc steps to meet our peace-loving initiatives halfway. Moreover, it is as if they have been trying not to notice the large-scale armed forces and arms cuts on which the Warsaw Pact states are now embarked. Instead, the Brussels conference again talked about "circumspection," "vigilance," and "Soviet superiority," tried to persuade the allies not to rush into expanding even

economic cooperation with Eastern countries, and called for the "arsenal of deterrence to be maintained at the proper level." Many speakers talked up the plans for modernizing shorter-range nuclear missiles—advocated by the United States, Britain, and certain other alliance members. One got the impression that NATO intends just to demand new concessions from the Eastern states and new reductions in their armed forces and armaments but is totally unwilling to draw up a program of similar measures of its own.

This impression was further intensified against the backdrop of the U.S. Administration's continuing delay in formulating its own approach to the problem of disarmament and Soviet-U.S. relations. And NATO has not yet proposed its long-promised coordinated strategy with regard to the socialist countries' peace initiatives. There is no doubt that the questions are difficult and require appropriate elaboration. But the statements currently coming out of Washington and certain other NATO capitals on the need to build up and modernize nuclear arsenals rather than reduce them cannot fail to put us on our guard. They show just how powerful the forces still are that want to see new nuclear missiles rather than candles on NATO's current and future "birthday cakes." So are the NATO organizations really unable to think other than in terms that are 40 years old and culled from the height of the "cold war"? One would like to hope not. One would like to hope that NATO is prepared in actions rather than in words to change the confrontational nature of the alliance and channel its efforts into finding a political settlement for the world's problems and seeking compromises likely to lead to a decisive reduction in levels of military confrontation. The parallel talks under way in Vienna on conventional armed forces and armaments and on confidence-building measures and stability in Europe are creating entirely favorable conditions and prerequisites for this. The hitherto unilateral measures by the socialist states in making their armies exclusively defensive and restricting their power to the framework of reasonable sufficiency are designed to improve the international climate.

In this situation it would be exceedingly appropriate for NATO, which is entering the 5th decade of its existence—quite a mature age—to stop leaving a nasty taste in the mouth with its "caution" and desire for overarmament and start displaying farsightedness and a constructive approach to the difficult problems of our interdependent world.

Western European Union Council Meets in London

Conclusions Listed

LD0404121889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0230 GMT 4 Apr 89

[Text] A session of the Western European Union [WEU] Council at the level of ministers of defense and foreign affairs of this military and political group has ended in London. The time for the session, the eve of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Great Britain, was not chosen by accident of course. The session paid paramount attention, of course, to everything happening in the USSR. At what conclusions did the representatives of the nine countries taking part in this meeting arrive?

First, they acknowledged the presence of new thinking in the USSR in matters relating to human rights and to resolving regional conflicts.

Second, they made note of the existence of inspiring signs that the Warsaw Treaty states intend to work constructively in the sphere of reducing conventional arms in Europe.

Third, Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of foreign and commonwealth affairs, who chaired the meeting, accused the USSR of attempts to extend the Vienna talks beyond the limits of their mandate by discussing matters connected with reducing the activeness of naval forces and the creation of demilitarized corridors.

Fourth, the ministers decided the Vienna talks on chemical weapons should end with the signing of a treaty on the complete banning and scrapping of this type of weaponry.

At the same time, the ministers insisted that the USSR should show much more activeness in this matter, since they believe that our reserves of chemical weapons are far in excess of those in the West. All this was stated at the session of the WEU Council. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the more detailed point of view of this military and political group will also be set forth at the upcoming British-Soviet summit meeting.

UK's Howe Comments

PM0404154689 London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 4 Apr 89 p 10

[Simon Scott Palmer report: "Russians To Face Challenge on Arms Cuts"]

[Text] The government will urge Mr Gorbachev to produce detailed proposals for conventional arms cuts in Europe, and to be more honest about Soviet chemical weapon stocks, during his visit to Britain this week, Sir Geoffrey Howe said yesterday.

Moscow has said it has 50,000 tonnes of chemical weapons but the West believes the real total could be six times as large.

At the conventional arms talks, which opened in Vienna last month, NATO has put forward a detailed plan for cuts which has yet to be matched by the Warsaw Pact.

The foreign secretary said at the end of a Western European Union meeting in London that regional issues, including Afghanistan, southern Africa and Central America, and human rights questions, from Jewish refuseniks to press freedom, would also be on the Anglo-Soviet summit agenda.

Foreign and defence ministers of the Union, a nine-nation defence organisation, agreed to open ministerial consultations with Turkey and to offer the same arrangement to Greece. Both countries want to join.

The ministers instructed officials to study a French proposal to set up a WEU institute of strategic studies.

Mr George Younger, defence secretary, said there was scope for greater co-operation on military training among members.

Civil Aviation Protocol Ratification Deposited

LD0304235489 Moscow TASS in English 2318 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—A certificate on the Soviet Union's ratification of a protocol on combatting illegal acts of violence at international airports, which was signed in Montreal on February 24, 1988, has been deposited with the secretary-general of the International Civil Aviation Organisation, it was announced here Monday.

The protocol supplements a convention on combatting illegal acts jeopardising civil aviation safety, which was adopted in Montreal on September 23, 1971.

United States and Canada

Former NATO Commander Reveals Arms Plan

LD0604125889 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Washington April 6 TASS—Retired General Andrew J. Goodpaster, a former commander of NATO who helped shape the Atlantic alliance, has proposed bringing half of U.S. forces home from Europe by the mid 1990s.

The Goodpaster Plan, which could be carried out under a negotiated cutback of NATO and Warsaw Pact military strength, calls for "radical restructuring" of East and West military forces in Europe to levels that are roughly equal and at least 50 percent lower than current NATO strength.

The plan has been set forth in a study paper published by a NATO support group for the 40th anniversary of the Atlantic alliance.

THE WASHINGTON POST indicated today that the plan "goes far beyond the current NATO proposal in recently initiated East-West conventional arms negotiations in Vienna."

Goodpaster believes that the move is needed as a response to major initiatives by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and intensified pressures in the West for NATO "burden-sharing" and unilateral U.S. withdrawals from Europe.

"If the new Soviet policy set out by General Secretary Gorbachev becomes a reality in fact," Goodpaster wrote in introducing his proposal, "The whole security structure the world has known since mid-century becomes open to a series of major transforming changes."

U.S. Policy in Latin America Questioned

LD0604093589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2130 GMT 5 Apr 89

["The White House's Strange Position Regarding Settlement in Central America."—TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, 6 Apr (TASS)—Correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Countries of the Western Hemisphere followed with unflagging interest M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Cuba and his talks with Fidel Castro. Numerous "crews" of major media agencies, including American, were sent to Havana to cover the meeting of Soviet and Cuban leaders. Judging by reports from Latin American capitals, everywhere on the continent both the official circles—excluding Chilean ones—and the public saw the results of the meeting as a contribution not only to the cause of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Cuban peoples but also to the cause of ensuring a more favorable atmosphere for seeking solutions for such a problem as, say, settling the conflict situaton in Central America.

But what is the official reaction from Washington, whose policy over the last 8 years, including massive supplies of arms to the contras, has been the main reason for the growth in the scope of the conflict in the region? This reaction is at the very least strange, which is demonstrated by the statement made Wednesday by the White House spokesman. It notes that "We were following with great attention here what President Gorbachev said in Havana," that "we welcome his words regarding the undesirability of exporting revolution," and that the Soviet-Cuban treaty on friendship and cooperation signed in Havana "to all appearances obliges both countries to strive for a peaceful settlement in the region." But then "advice" follows or, to be more precise, demands regarding the subject of what policy toward a Central American country such as Nicaragua and toward Cuba the Soviet Union "should" or "should not" pursue.

Moreover, the White House, judging by the statement, is altogether "refusing" the Soviet Union the right to have such relations with Central American countries as they may mutually deem necessary. But the United States is a different matter, they say. Thus, having demanded an end to Soviet supplies of arms to Nicaragua, on whose borders still "hang" formations of contras armed by the United States and located in Honduras in bases effectively belonging to the United States, and demanding "exertion of pressure" on that country, just as on Cuba, the White House spokesman at the same time rejected the Soviet proposal to halt all arms supplies to the Central American region. "We reject," he said, "the very idea of equivalence of legitimate interests of the United States and the Soviet presence in Central America."

The White House spokesman made assurances that the United States supports the process of settlement in the region advanced by the leaders of the countries of Central America. But who is not aware that the United States to this day sees its said "legitimate interests" primarily in keeping afloat the fighting formations of contras, for which they have again allocated many millions—True, what they assure is humanitarian aid to the contras. There are already a host of examples of humanitarian aid having repeatedly been used by the contras and their "sponsors" for routine purchases of armaments, examples which came to the surface in particular as a result of the "Iran-contragate" scandal, the legal examination of which is still in progress in the U.S. capital.

U.S. Should Make 'Next Move' on Central America

LD0604133989 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Mikhail Mayorov commentary]

[Text] Observers in Havana and around the world are commenting on the outcome of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Cuba. More from Mikhail Mayorov, and this is what he writes:

The outcome of the Havana talks left both sides satisfied. This is more than a point of joint final statement. Moscow and Havana made it plain that their dialogue is a dialogue of two friends—it's frank, democratic, and free of pitfalls. On the eve of the visit some Western journalists voiced what they called an expert opinion about the erosion in Soviet-Cuban relations. But the progress of the talks revealed a [words indistinct] for those who would like to draw the two countries politically apart. To do so, they've been playing the differences in the process under way in the Soviet Union and Cuba. Soviet restructuring, they claim, has found no support from Fidel Castro. But why should the two nations copy each other's policies? The Cubans are free to deal with their problems their own way. The specifics of their development fail to conceal the basic common features that is, the teaching of Marxism-Leninism and the care for people's well-being. The sides pointed out in Havana that their good relations could not be affected by their present-day interests. The talks revealed shared approaches to key international issues. Both the Soviet Union and Cuba work for lasting peace, removing the nuclear threat, and settling regional conflicts.

Before and during the visit Western journalists kept the focus on the two countries' positions on Central America. Some expected the two leaders to offer a cure for the Central American crisis. As it was, Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro spoke out for a negotiated settlement of the regional problems by the Central American countries. The Soviet leader suggested that bloodshed in the region could be ended earlier if all outside arms supplies to Central America were cut off. Some observers say these proposals do not amount to a cure. But it's up to Washington to make the next move to settling the conflict. It could do so by renouncing its power policies in the region.

At a news conference in Havana, a Chilean journalist revealed a biased view of Soviet-Cuban relations by asking about what he called Moscow's diktat as regards Cuba. Fidel Castro strongly protested the question being posed that way. Mikhail Gorbachev, he said, did not come to this country to lecture the Cubans. This feeling seems to be shared by the Cubans at large, and it is also one of the outcomes of Mikhail Gorbachev's first visit to Cuba.

U.S.-Soviet Dialogue on Central America Urged

LD0604131889 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 5 Apr 89

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] During his visit to Cuba, Mikhail Gorbachev discussed among other things the situation in Central America. Commentary is by Vladislav Kozyakov:

Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro agreed that however complex regional problems may be they must be dealt with by political means. Both leaders called for an end to the arms supplies to Central America from whatever party. The Soviet leader confirmed that this country is not trying to secure any political or strategic advantage in the Western Hemisphere, nor does it plan to have any military bases there. This country has proposed creating zones of peace and cooperation in Central and South America. In the Soviet-Cuban Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed during the visit the two sides reaffirmed their commitment to a policy of noninterference in the affairs of other nations.

My own view is that these and other reports from Cuba should not pass unnoticed in Washington, where United States policy on East-West relations is at present under review. It is also my view that a reply has now been given to Washington's statement that it counts on Moscow's collaboration in dealing with the settlement in Central America as part of Soviet-American dialogue. The Soviet Union has expressed and demonstrated its desire to account for the stands of all parties concerned. Five presidents in the region have supported the plan, and Moscow has made efforts to remove Washington's concerns.

Regrettably the response from the United States has been a controversial one. On the one hand no calls have been made for toppling the government of Nicaragua, but on the other hand aid to the Contras has continued. Numerous statements have been made to emphasize the need to respect the rights and freedoms of other nations, but at the same time Vice President Dan Quayle apparently regards Latin America as a backyard of the United States.

While in Havana President Gorbachev reaffirmed this country's commitment to new political thinking with respect to all international problems as well as regional problems. He said that in spite of all the problems international relations have shown signs of improving. I believe that the pooling of efforts by the Soviet Union, the United States, and other nations will lead to an improvement of the situation in Central America.

Shamir, Mubarak, Husayn Visit U.S. for Talks

Shamir News Conference

LD0404113889 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 4 Apr 89

[Text] Beirut April 4 TASS—Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir told a news conference, before his departure for a 10-day visit to the United States, that "the aim of the talks in the United States is to exchange ideas and opinions with the administration and to estimate together the chances for opening peace negotiations."

Shamir said that he was taking to Washington a few proposals on facilitating settlement in the Middle East, but refused to disclose details.

Israeli officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity, told reporters that Shamir's "initiatives" involved electing Palestinian representatives in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip for talks with Tel Aviv authorities, on condition that the Palestine popular uprising ends. Shamir flatly rejects the idea of an international conference on the Middle East and is opposed to Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands. Thus the proposed "elections" will be effectively held at gunpoint. It is not accidental that the Shamir plan, whose main points have been leaked to the press, was rejected by the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

A spokesman for the U.S. State Department, where Israel enjoys traditional support, was also unenthusiastic about the plans of the Israeli premier. He said in an interview with Israeli television that the prime minister's proposals fell short of a diplomatic breakthrough.

Shamir also stressed at the news conference that his visit was "an opportunity to freshen the ties of friendship and cooperation that exist between us and the United States." He noted that the issues discussed in Washington will include extending strategic cooperation between the two states and U.S. aid to Tel Aviv.

As is known, Israel is the main recipient of U.S. military-economic aid. Its annual volume has now reached three billion dollars and much of the money is used to bolster Israeli military capacities.

Talks With Baker

LD0604144989 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Washington April 6 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Andrey Fedyashin:

Talks were held in Washington on Wednesday [5 April] between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir who had arrived in the United States for a visit.

The meeting took place within the framework of the start of intensive consultations by the new U.S. Administration on Middle East settlement problems. The talks held between Egyptian President Mubarak and George Bush and later on Baker in the U.S. capital on Monday and Tuesday became the first round of the consultations.

The third round will be held on April 17 when King Husayn of Jordan will arrive in Washington on Wednesday three hours after Shamir's arrival but there was no meeting between them.

Both Shamir and Baker were extremely reserved in an evaluation of the exchange of views. Shamir only limited himself to a statement that the two sides discussed some ways to settle the problems connected with the conflict between Israel and the Arab world, including Arab countries and Palestinian Arabs residing in Israel. He emphasized that the talks were very friendly.

The U.S. secretary of state was still more reserved in his evaluations. He said the prime minister made a number of proposals and that "They hopefully will form the basis under which we can move the peace process forward. As the prime minister indicated, we still have some talking to do."

Both Baker and Shamir declined outright to give any details of the prposals brought by the Israeli prime minister to Washington by pleading that they did not want to discuss them before the proposals would be submitted by Shamir to President Bush during a meeting scheduled for Thursday.

Judging by U.S. press reports, the Israeli prime minister intends to suggest holding an election among "Palestinian Arabs" in the West Bank of the Jordan and Gaza sector and granting a limited self-government to the population of the territories but without the PLO's participation and only in exchange for an end to the Arab population's uprising.

Before arriving in Washington Shamir had stated in New York that he would not agree to any talks with the PLO, to Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories or to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. Both Bush and Baker unequivocally stated during their meeting with the Egyptian president that a settlement should include Israel's withdrawal from the captured territories. Bush recognised the usefulness of an international Middle East peace conference but did not agree with Mubarak over the question as to when such a conference should be organised. Besides, both the U.S. President and the U.S. secretary of state directly hinted to Israel that it eventually would probably have to agree to a direct dialogue with the PLO, the dialogue which had already been started by Washington.

The irreconcilable stand of the leader of the ultrarightist coalition Likud and the stubbornness with which he declines to show flexibility in the approach to a Middle East settlement create serious problems to the new U.S. Administration.

On the one hand, the U.S. Administration by no means intends to throw its main strategic ally in the region at the mercy of fate. On the other hand, it becomes increasingly difficult for it to uphold the interests of Israel which ignores the fresh opportunities for breaking the Middle East 'stalemate', which disregards the PLO's positive proposals, and which at the same time continues its brutal repressive actions in the occupied territories. All this complicates the current talks in Washington.

U.S. Appoints Representative to Afghan Rebels

LD0704084989 Moscow TASS in English 0812 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Washington April 7 TASS—The U.S. State Department has confirmed U.S. press reports that the Bush administration decided to appoint a special representative in the ambassador rank to the "Afghan rebel government".

Margaret Tutwiler, an official State Department spokesman, noted on Thursday [6 April] that she could not say who will be named to this post. The new representative will stay in Washington but is expected to spend much time in the region, entering into contact with Afghan resistance leaders and others, she said.

The appointment of the special representative does not mean an official recognition of the Afghan interim government and we do not establish diplomatic relations with it, Tutwiler went on. Control over territory, broad popular support, an effective government structure and capability to undertake international commitments remain to be our criteria for establishing diplomatic relations, she said.

The State Department spokesman furthermore noted that the United States does not recognize the Kabul regime as a lawful government. It maintains contacts with this regime only on consular and administrative issues.

According to American press reports, Secretary of State James Baker recommended Peter Tomsen, charge d'affaires of the United States in the People's Republic of China, to the post of special representative to the "Afghan rebel government."

U.S. Diplomacy Contributing to Afghan War

LD0604215289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Aleksandr Malikov Commentary]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST reports that the U.S. Administration has appointed a special representative of the U.S. President, with the rank of ambassador, to the armed Afghan opposition. According to the newspaper, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has selected for the post Peter Thomsen, a high-ranking diplomat who has worked at the U.S. Embassy in the PRC. Here is a commentary by Aleksandr Malikov.

So, the diplomatic corps of U.S. ambassadors has been increased by one more. But the move made by the State Department leaves one with a sense of a certain ambiguity. After all, it has been made very clumsily, if only from the standpoint of the universally recognized diplomatic standards. Peter Thomsen will have to carry out his duties in relation to the Afghan opposition, whose provisional interim government is still not recognized by a single Western country, including the United States itself. In addition to this obvious illogicality, Peter Thomsen will, initially at least, be in Washington rather than in Peshawar or somewhere in Afghanistan. All this is quite understandable, of course. Where can an ambassador base himself if the armed opposition is completley unable to capture a single major center inside the country?

In fact, the State Department has really dispatched an ambassador to no one and to nowhere. However, as the saying goes, there is also a certain logic in the absence of logic. The U.S. press has stated that the United States is now afraid, on the one hand, of losing control of the situation within the Afghan opposition, which is riddled with contradictions, and, on the other, of forfeiting control of the supplies of arms precisely to those groupings that it would like to see in power in Kabul. The Bush administration's diplomatic formula for Afghanistan thus amounts to further saturating the opposition with weapons, and to coordinating the military—precisely the military, I stress, and no other—activities of the opposition inside Afghanistan.

In other words, we are faced with the same old inertia of thought based on force, and the same blind urge to solve the Afghan problem by military rather than peaceful means. Even though, as the second guarantor of the Geneva agreements, Washington should, logically, be applying its diplomatic efforts in the diametrically opposite direction by combining them, in the first place, with the efforts made by our country. And agreeing, if necessary, on a moratorium on all military supplies to the belligerent sides, and then by combining its efforts with the diplomacy of the United Nations. After all, Afghanistan has to be given, at the very least, the opportunity to be heard from the UN rostrum. I say nothing about going further—about the need for the United States, too, to involve itself, at long last, in the search for possible ways of disengaging the conflicting sides in Afghanistan, and in arranging an intra-Afghan dialogue.

No, it is not a diplomatic game in Afghan affairs that the international community expects of Washington, but serious and, above all, responsible diplomacy. I think that it is no exaggeration to say that the Afghan test—that is, the test for commitment to the settlement of regional conflicts by peaceful means, in the spirit of the new thinking—is being taken not only in Moscow, Kabul, and Islamabad, but in Washington as well. The Afghan Government's appeal to President Bush to review U.S. hostile policy toward Afghanistan is still relevant in this sense. It is not just a matter of the devaluation of U.S. policy in the eyes of the world community, but also in the eyes of ordinary Afghans. At this point, I cannot resist quoting one official within the U.S. Administration, who observed that you cannot win people's hearts and minds by the evening if you bomb them in the morning. Yet it is precisely the continuation of the fratricidal war that is actually being promoted by Washington's secret and official diplomacy at the present stage.

China

PRC Journalists Delegation Continues Visit

OW0604075389 Moscow In Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 30 Mar 89

[Text] The delegation of the All-China Journalists' Association headed by Tan Wenrui, vice chairman of the All-China Journalists' Association and editor in chief of RENMIN RIBAO, is continuing its Soviet Union visit. During the visit, the Chinese journalists have held talks with responsible persons of some Soviet organs to understand the progress of reform in the Soviet Union.

Today, First Deputy Chairman of the State Planning Committee Sitaryan met with the Chinese journalist delegation. He introduced the special features of economic reform in the Soviet Union and explained certain problems in developing the national economy to the Chinese guests.

Earlier, the delegation of the All-China Journalists' Association visited the training center for Soviet cosmonauts on the outskirts of Moscow City and was warmly and pleasantly received there. Soviet Cosmonaut Zudov introduced the history and current situation of the Soviet space program and the development of international contacts in this field to the Chinese guests. He hoped that Soviet and Chinese experts could develop cooperation in this field. The Chinese journalists visited the training center and facilities there with great interest.

Journalists Discuss Reform

PM0304114189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 6

[V. Ovchinnikov report: "Journalists' Discussions"]

[Text] "Reforms in China and restructuring in the USSR: Experience, Problems, Prospects." A 2-day discussion on that theme has been held in Moscow by the USSR Journalists' Union on the occasion of the arrival of visitors from Beijing—a delegation of the All-China Journalists Association headed by Comrade Tan Wenrui, chief editor of RENMIN RIBAO.

The press workers questioned each other in detail on the positive and negative experiences that each of the two countries has accumulated in the process of developing and improving their economic and political systems. The Chinese visitors noted in particular that in addition to increasing the effectiveness of economic management, market mechanisms sometimes have adverse side effects. The expansion of the independence of enterprises may lead to undesirable disproportions, make it difficult to achieve the rational distribution of scarce resources in the interests of priority sectors, and aggravate the shortage of raw materials, energy, transport, and so forth. And this cannot be ignored.

In the words of the Chinese journalists, the 10 years' experience of reforms in the PRC also provide a warning that the restructuring of the economic mechanism, the existence of state enterprises alongside collective and individual forms of labor activity, and the lack of coordination in prices (state, contract, and market) provide fertile soil for speculation, fraud, and corruption. It is not easy to prevent the practice whereby the relatives and friends of functionaries at various levels set up in business and make vast profits thanks to their preferential access to raw materials, fuel, and transport. According to a decision of the 3d Plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 13th convocation, the struggle against the degeneration of party and state cadres has been stepped up. All organs of power have been instructed to ensure that their activity and its results are fully publicized. People's control points have been created throughout the country.

After analyzing the difficulties which each of the two countries has encountered in the process of restructuring and reforms, the participants in the discussion came to the conclusion that journalists must provide fuller and more comprehensive coverage of the complex processes of the renewal of socialism, talk not only about the successes but also the failures, and analyze the positive and the negative experience so as to draw lessons from it.

In addition to Moscow the delegation of Chinese journalists is also visiting Leningrad, Riga, and Kiev.

Corruption Said 'Impeding Reform' in China

PM0404155789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "China: Rebuffing Corruption"]

[Text] Beijing, 3 Apr—The struggle against negative phenomena in party and state organs must be stepped up and there must be a resolute struggle for purity within their ranks, Chen Zuolin, deputy secretary of the CPC Central Discipline Inspection Commission, has said.

In an interview published by RENMIN RIBAO he dwelt in detail on the problem of "honesty and incorruptibility within the party and state apparatus."

Delegates to the latest session of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC] analyzed in their speeches certain "phenomena of disintegration" within the party such as corruption, bribery, utilization of official position for selfish ends, and so on. This, Chen Zuolin stressed, is a serious problem which is in effect impeding the cause of reform and modernization of the country. According to him, "in the course of major changes within society the dregs are floating to the surface."

Every leader should have a genuine, businesslike, party-minded, and supremely responsible attitude to these questions. Moreover, we should rely as broadly as possible on the masses and on their support in order to

successfully combat bad phenomena within society. Only then will one be able to speak about the success of the matter. We must always remember, Chen Zuolin pointed out, that all these defects do the country irreparable damage.

China Denies Selling Arms to Iran

PM0304162389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Teletype"]

[Text] Beijing, 30 Mar—A PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman today denied foreign press allegations that China has sold a large consignment of arms to Iran. The PRC, the statement stressed, invariably adopts a cautious and responsible position on the question of the arms trade and will not take any steps to damage the achievement of reconciliation between Iran and Iraq.

Vlasov Receives PRC Provincial Delegation

LD0504223589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Vlasov today received a delegation of the Committee for External contacts of Heilongjiang Province in the PRC, headed by Wang Yaochen, chairman of the committee. The onward development of Soviet-Chinese relations was noted with satisfaction during the conversation, as well as the great significance which the forthcoming visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the PRC will have for strengthening relations. The guests told of the warm welcome which was accorded them in Moscow and during their visits to Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Irkutsk, and Bratsk, and of the fruitful conversations which they have had on questions of mutually beneficial cooperation in various spheres. A unanimous opinion was expressed during the meeting concerning the necessity of further development of all-round collaboration between the RSFSR and Heilongjiang province. The conversation took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Kazakhstan, Xinjiang Develop Economic Ties

OW0604201189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 30 Mar 89

[Petrovskiy commentary— from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: Direct economic exchanges between the border areas of the Soviet Union and China have become increasingly important in the overall economic cooperation between the two countries. Increased direct exchanges between the Kazakh SSR and China's Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region are a case in point. In this regard, our station commentator Petrovskiy writes:

Trade between Kazakhstan and China's Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region is developing rapidly, and the trade volume is increasing steadily. The Soviets supply automobiles, steel products, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, building materials, fertilizers, and other products to the Chinese, while the Chinese ships agricultural produce, knitwear products, textile products, fur and leather products, cloth, and sports shoes to the Soviets. The commodity exchange has greatly increased the varieties of consumer goods sold in the stores of the two countries' border areas.

Goods from both sides of the border have to go through the Soviet border defense checkpoint at Khorgos. A new bridge will be constructed over the Khorgos River next October to improve the conditions of cargo shipment. This bridge will be built jointly by the Soviets and Chinese. Direct border trade between Kazakhstan and the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region is expected to increase several times. This is why it is necessary to create the necessary conditions for the shipment of increased commodities.

Both the Soviet Union and China have shown interest in resuming the construction of a railway line to link Kazakhstan with Xinjiang. The construction of the railway line first started in the 1950's but was subsequently suspended. Last autumn, the representatives of the two countries reached an agreement to resume the construction. Direct railway transportation between Kazakhstan and Xinjiang will materialize in the second half of 1992. The rapid increase of the border trade between Kazakhstan and Xinjiang requires further development of the transportation system.

Economic cooperation between the two countries, including the establishment of joint ventures, has already begun. For example, a joint venture for the production of paint is being set up in Kazakhstan, while a joint mineral fertilizer factory is also being built. In addition, preparation for the establishment of a joint venture to smelt nonferrous metals is under way. An agreement for joint geological prospecting for this project has been reached. Direct business links between commercial enterprises of the two countries are also being established. For example, department stores in Alma-Ata and Taldy-Kurgan are establishing such links with their counterparts in Urumqi and Kuqa.

The growth of economic exchanges between USSR's Kazakhstan and China's Xinjiang, like the growth of mutually beneficial economic cooperation between other border regions of the two countries, reflects our times as well as the wishes of the Soviet and Chinese peoples to seek neighborly ties.

Northeast Asia

FSX Talks Show 'Crack' in U.S.-Japan Relations

18070202 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by I. Latyshev, PRAVDA correspondent: "Who Is Going to Be Secure?"]

[Text] Tokyo 4 April—One more crack has appeared in Japanese-American relations. At issue is the inability of the Governments of Japan and the United States to come to a mutually acceptable agreement concerning joint design and production of a new-generation fighter-bomber (code-named FSX) for the Japanese "self-defense forces."

Fruitless talks held last week in Washington between Deputy Director of the Japan Defense Agency S. Nishihiro and Ambassador of Japan in the United States N. Matsunaga, on the one side, and several representatives of the American Government, including Secretary of State J. Baker, on the other side, testify to this inability. As the Japanese newspapers report, these talks were at an impasse, and were discontinued due to pronounced disagreements which had emerged among the participants.

The persistent demand of the United States to allocate at least 40 percent of the overall scope of work on designing and manufacturing the above type of aircraft to the American company "General Dynamics" became one of the most significant causes of the emergent differences. This demand is rejected by the Japanese side which thinks that the Japanese company "Mitsubishi Jukogyo" should be the main contractor for this project. In addition, the Japanese side also considered unacceptable "the excessively strict" constraints within which the American side agrees to provide scientific-technical and military secrets to the above Japanese firm in the course of developing the FSX aircraft.

The current impasse in the Japanese-American talks associated with the cooperation of military and business circles of the two countries not only testifies to the emergence of serious apprehensions in the United States about leaking to Japan secret information of a technical and military nature. Another new circumstance is apparent, namely, an appreciable growth of the "arrogance" of the representatives of the Japanese Government, and the persistence of the Japanese side in defending the plans it has devised. The erstwhile flexibility and pliancy of Japanese statesmen in negotiations with the American partners are more and more often turning into firmness and rigidity. In this respect, the following demonstrative gesture by the Japanese is characteristic: at the end of the week, without waiting for the negotiations to finish, the Japanese Government represented by the Japan Defense Agency proceeded to sign unilaterally an official contract with the "Mitsubishi Jukogyo" company concerning the design and production of the FSX aircraft. This deliberate haste in the actions of Tokyo incurred "the wrath of American congressmen," and is threatening to bring about new complications.

The definite impasse at which the talks are at present is interpreted by the Japanese press as a beginning of a new stage in Japanese-American relations. The newspaper ASAHI notes that thus far the differences between the two countries in the sphere of economics, and primarily trade, were viewed in both Tokyo and Washington as a minor detail of bilateral relations. These differences were usually set against the unity of views and actions of the two countries in the sphere of their military-political cooperation on the basis of the Japanese-American "security treaty." At present, in the course of negotiations on the joint design and production of the new combat aircraft for the Japanese "self-defense forces," the differences between the two countries have grown, and spread to military issues.

The organ of the Socialist Party of Japan Central Committee, the newspaper SHAKAI SHINPO brought out a large article which suggests that the plans for developing the Japanese fighter-bomber of a new generation with U.S. participation are far from defensive in nature. This article voices the opinion that the main driving motive for developing this aircraft is found in the intention of the leadership of the Japanese "self-defense forces" to revise their current defensive doctrine, and proceed in the future from possibly conducting offensive operations against the Soviet Union in coordination with the U.S. armed forces. In the opinion of the newspaper, all of this brings about the expansion of the arms race, and undermines the foundations of the national security of Japan.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Cambodia

LD0604172789 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A statment by the USSR Foreign Ministry was issued here today:

On April 5 the Governments of Kampuchea, Laos and Vietnam came forward with a major political initiative to promote the earliest settlement of the Kampuchean conflict, one of the most complex regional conflicts.

In the joint statement the three governments outlined the following steps, whose implementation could remove obstacles in the way of Indochinese settlement:

—complete withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteer troops from Kampuchea by late September 1989,
—simultaneous cessation of foreign military aid to all Kampuchean sides and interference from outside into the Kampuchean internal affairs,

—resumption of the work of the International Control Commission set up under the 1954 Geneva Agreements, which was to supervise the fulfillment of the above-mentioned measures (the make-up and functions of the commission are to be considered additionally),
—a call on all interested states to facilitate the resumption of the meeting between Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Kampuchea Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, talks between all Kampuchea sides, the achievement by them of agreements on the internal aspects of the Kampuchean problem.

The countries of Indochina, despite the existing difficulties, consistently and persistently seek and find unordinary approaches in order to untie the Kampuchean knot. Their new action followed the agreements at regional meetings in Jakarta with the participation of Khmer sides. All those who are sincerely interested in the complete normalization of the situation in South-East Asia must appreciate it.

The Soviet Union welcomes the statement by the Governments of Kampuchea, Laos and Vietnam and regards it as a balanced and workable programme of action designed to give a powerful impetus to tackling, in the shortest possible time, both external and internal aspects of the political settlement in Indochina. It is important now to start elaborating effective measures to prevent relapses into the Pol Pot atrocities and the flare up of civil war in Kampuchea after the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops.

Now that the negotiating process in the region enters into the stage of practical decisions, all interested sides and states are required to display a responsible approach, take account of the existing realities, and primarily respect all interests of the Kampuchean people. Only this way will lead to full elimination of the flashpoints of tension in South East Asia and create the zones of peace there. For its part the Soviet Union is prepared to do everything possible to attain that goal.

Indochinese Statement on SRV Withdrawal Viewed

'Bold,' 'Correct' Step

LD0604222189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1433 GMT 6 Apr 89

["The Statement of the Governments of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—TASS observer Sergey Afonin writes: With a view to speeding up the withdrawal from the Cambodian labyrinth, a bold and correct step has been taken—namely a joint statement of the governments of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese voluntary forces from Cambodia before the end of this September.

The decision in question was made on the basis of an analysis of the real situation in the People's Republic of Kampuchea, in the spirit of the accords reached in various negotiation processes, including the informal Jakarta meetings on Cambodia, taking into account worldwide trends. It fully meets the interests of the Cambodian people and the cause of peace, stability, and cooperation in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

The new initiative testifies to the stability of the situation in Cambodia. Indeed, over the 10 years of its existence the People's Republic of Kampuchea has become stronger in all respects. These were years of a genuine revival of the Cambodian people, and of the defense of its revolutionary gains. Vietnam, Laos, the Soviet Union, and other friends in the world are continuing to give specific assistance the the young republic. The People's Republic of Kampuchea has sufficient strength to confidently follow the chosen course, and if need be, to stand up for itself. Therefore, the departure of the Vietnamese troops, which worthily fulfilled their internationalist duty, is perfectly logical and opportune.

The governments of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam have reiterated their adherence to a political settlement of the Cambodian problem and their readiness to assist in every way for it being achieved quickly. The reactions of the world public show that this new step by the three fraternal countries has met with very wide understanding. This is evidence of the further growth of their international prestige.

The complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia is one of the questions which was discussed probably most of all in the world community during the past few years. Many countries, including China, the United States, Japan, the ASEAN states, and others have made and are making the possibility of the normalization of relations with Vietnam dependent on the resolution of the aforementioned question. Inasmuch, as they say, the stumbling block is being removed from the road, it is now up to them.

Vietnam has undertaken a firm new obligation, which it will carry out, official circles in Hanoi stress. But a number of complicated problems still remain regarding the Cambodian settlement. Above all is that a restoration of the Polpotist regime of genocide in Cambodia after the departure of the Vietnamese troops should not be permitted and that there should be a cessation of external interference and foreign military aid to the Cambodian side.

There are two variants of the development of events. The positive resolution under the observation of an international monitoring commission of the enumerated problems relating to the external aspects of the Cambodian problem will lead to a cessation of the civil war in Cambodia and will speed up a settlement by the Cambodian sides of the country's internal problems on the basis of a national reconciliation before September 1989. By the way, in the next few days a meeting of the working commission of the Cambodian sides is to take place in Paris and a meeting between Hun Sen, chairman of the People's Republic of Kampuchea Council of Ministers, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk is planned for the beginning of May in Jakarta. The internal affairs of this country are in the hands of the Cambodians themselves, and they are fully capable of sorting out their own problems independently.

It will be apposite to recall here the USSR and PRC foreign ministers' statement, in which it was pointed out that both sides consider that as the Vietnamese troops are withdrawn from Cambodia, so should all states involved carry out a gradual reduction of military aid to any of the Cambodian parties, right up to the complete cessation of this aid.

Continuation of this aid, the statement by the three governments points out, will wreck the process of political settlement, will create conditions for a return of the regime of genocide to Cambodia, and will give rise to a new civil war. In such an event, the Kampuchean People's Republic reserves the right to call upon other countries to render assistance to the Cambodian people in self-defense, in strict accordance with the UN charter and the principles of the Nonaligned Movement.

The statement by the governments of the Kampuchean People's Republic the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a serious and weighty contribution toward affirming positive processes in the world. The forces of peace and progress have once again demonstrated the consistency and resourcefulness of their policy, which is designed to find a way out of any political labyrinth.

Pullout Offer Hailed

BK0604062789 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Station Observer Igor Lebedev's commentary]

[Text] The Governments of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have just issued a joint statement dealing with the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia and the cessation of foreign interference and military aid to all Cambodian parties by the end of September 1989.

Our observer Igor Lebedev has this to say:

Lately the West has expressed considerable doubt about Vietnam's sincerity in its announced decision to withdraw its volunteer troops from Cambodia. This suspicion, in my opinion, is now being dispelled, for Hanoi has announced without any ambiguity the timetable for the departure of the last Vietnamese combatant from Cambodia—to be more exact, by the end of September this year.

This decision, in my opinion, reflects both the high appreciation of the capacity of the Cambodian people to defend their own country by themselves against all outside aggression and the resolute desire to eliminate once and for all any obstacle to the political solution of the Cambodian problem. Moreover, Vietnam has always stressed the transient nature of the presence of its troops in Cambodia. In the treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation signed by the two countries on 18 February 1979—a little more than 1 month after the liberation of Phnom Penh from the criminal Pol Pot regime—it was clearly stated as follows: The Vietnamese troops are present in Cambodia for a period of time only.

Vietnam has expressed its goodwill by adopting this important decision. However, a just and correct solution to the Cambodian problem also requires that all foreign states respect their commitment to end military assistance to all Cambodian parties, especially the group of Pol Pot. I would like to stress that the United States and ASEAN countries have frequently voiced their opposition to the return to power of the Khmer Rouge. Now, in my opinion, it is time to turn words into deeds so that a political solution will be feasible. In Phnom Penh the objective is being looked at with a sense of realism. The People's Republic of Kampuchea reserves the right to call on other countries to assist it in its self-defense, something that is fully in conformity with the UN Charter and the principles of the nonaligned movement.

The statement of the three Indochinese countries has an important passage on which I would like to invite our listeners to focus their attention. It deals with the proposal for the reactivation of the International Control and Supervisory Commission made up of representatives from India, Poland, and Canada. It is proposed that the representatives of Indonesia and the United Nations be included in this commission so that it can monitor and witness the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops and the cessation of outside military assistance to all Cambodian parties. International control is a key aspect of the solution in Cambodia. The setting of a definite deadline for the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, a withdrawal made without any preconditions, constitutes another major step taken by the Indochinese countries on the path toward solving the chronic dispute in Cambodia.

Cambodian Beam Reports Statement

BK0704045089 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] A joint statement of the Vietnamese, Lao, and Cambodian Governments on the Cambodian problem was made public in Hanoi on Wednesday [5 April].

Among other things, this document talks about the withdrawal of all Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, the end of foreign interference, and the end of military assistance to Cambodian parties at the end of September 1989. The supervision of all these measures will be undertaken by the International Control Commission—with India, Poland, and Canada as members—and with the participation of the chairman of the Jakarta informal meeting on the Cambodian issue and the personal representative of the UN secretary general. After the withdrawal of all Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, if foreign countries do not abide by the agreement on ending military assistance to Cambodian parties, particularly to the genocidal Pol Pot clique, and do not end all kinds of interference in Cambodia's internal affairs, this would certainly destroy the process to settle the issue politically and create conditions for the genocidal regime's return to Cambodia.

In this case, the statement stressed, the People's Republic of Kampuchea [PRK] reserves the right to appeal to other countries for assistance for the purpose of self-defense of the Cambodian people. This is in complete agreement with the UN Charter and the principles of the Nonaligned Movement.

The statement stresses that Cambodia and Laos highly value the deeds of the Vietnamese volunteer army toward the Cambodian people in carrying out their mission and in returning home by the end of September 1989. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam firmly believe that through efforts of all parties concerned the Cambodian problem would soon be solved and Southeast Asia would be changed into a zone of peace, stability, friendship, and cooperation.

At a news conference held to mark the release of the joint statement of the Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Lao Governments, Comrade Hun Sen—member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Political Bureau, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and PRK foreign minister—said Cambodia has the capability to defend itself following the withdrawal of the Vietnamese Army. Comrade Hun Sen further said that the decision on the Vietnamese troop pullout was taken after carefully considering the balance of forces. We are not risking the Cambodian people's destiny. The head of the Cambodian Government pointed out that the forthcoming Soviet-Chinese summit will create favorable conditions for settling the Cambodian problem, but the main point is whether Cambodian parties can agree among themselves or not.

On the new meeting with Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, Comrade Hun Sen said: Samdech Norodom Sihanouk has agreed to this meeting in Jakarta in May; on my part, I am always ready to meet with Samdech Sihanouk.

Near East & South Asia

Military Analyst Views Aircraft Sales to Libya

LD0604183789 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] [Announcer] Washington and Jerusalem are reported to be discussing the issue of Soviet aircraft sales to Libya. More from our military observer, Colonel Edward Asaturov:

[Asaturov in Russian fading into English translation] A total of six Su-24d aircraft supplied to Libya can hardly merit the attention given to (?the fact) in Washington and Israel. Given that Libya has nearly 500 warplanes, including those of Western manufacture, the latest supply is too small in number to threaten Libya's neighbors, including Israel, as is claimed by Washington and Jerusalem. Given that Libya has (?both) jet bombers and various purpose fighter aircraft, the Su-24d's specification should give no ground for speculations about a new quality weapon.

For one reason or another, reports from Washington and Jerusalem have described the plane as a bomber at a time when NATO's classification assigns it to fighter aircraft, code naming it (?as) "Fencer". More than that, it has been in Soviet armories for nearly 15 years now. However the question arising is this: Why all the noise, and who stands to benefit from it?

Although I find it hard to explain Libya's decision to buy Soviet built Su-24-d's, I'm convinced that a country which repeatedly fell prey to aggression must certainly take care of its own security. To deter and repulse an attack, proper equipment is needed. It's precisely in this clue that I look upon latest reports on the supply of Soviet aircraft to Libya, said our military analyst, Edward Asaturov, in conclusion.

Afghanistan Marks Ramadan With Amnesty, Cease-Fire

Terminally Ill Prisoners Freed

LD0604161689 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul April 6 TASS—On the occasion of the Ramadan month, Afghan President Najibullah has issued an amnesty decree for all terminally ill prisoners, irrespective of their crimes and time spent in prison.

Talks With 'Rebels' Sought

LD0604103689 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul April 6 TASS—The Supreme Military Command of Afghanistan, proceeding from the principles of humanity and respect for Islam, has announced a ceasefire to mark the start of Ramadan, the Moslems' month of fasting, which began today.

It said in a statement here that Afghan people are confident of the ability of their armed forces, which have demonstrated their worth graphically since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country.

If the opposition refuses to observe the ceasefire, it will be dealt a crushing blow: Afghan armed forces won't allow the rebels to take advantage of the ceasefire by committing acts of sabotage and terrorism and staging attacks on cities and villages, the statement warned.

The Supreme Military Command urged opposition field commanders, including those operating in Nangarhar Province, to use the ceasefire for talks with authorities in order to bring about an early and peaceful political settlement in the country.

However, according to the FRANCE PRESS AGENCY, the president of the "interim government" of the Afghan armed opposition, Sebghatullah Mojaddedi, has rejected the ceasefire proposal.

Afghan 'Rebel', Indian Sikh Contacts Disclosed

Indian MP's 'Troubled'

LD0604122889 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] New Delhi April 6 TASS—Indian MPs are very much troubled by contacts between Sikh extremists and Afghan opposition groupings, backed as they are by the Pakistan military intelligence. These contacts were disclosed in a letter addressed by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, one of the irreconcilable opposition chieftains, to his representative in Delhi, the NATIONAL HERALD reports.

The parliament members have declared that this confirms the participation of foreign agents in attempts to destabilize the situation in the region. They called on the government to cut short such actions. The MPs demanded also the setting up of U.N. peace-keeping posts on the Afghan-Pakistan border in order to stop Pakistani interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan.

"Huge quantities of arms are being delivered to the Afghan-Pakistan border. They are sold there cheaply and then a part of them goes to terrorists in India", the parliament was told by Bali Ram Bhagat, former foreign minister of India. "The Afghan opposition", he noted, "has established contacts with Sikh organisations in Punjab and also with extremists in Jammu and Kashmir. Behind all this is 'the invisible hand' of the Pakistani military intelligence".

Gandhi Criticizes Pakistan

LD0704092689 Moscow TASS in English 0801 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] New Delhi April 7 TASS—The successful three week defence of the city of Jalalabad by Afghan troops has refuted Western mass media claims that the republican government would fall soon after the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, Indian prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi, said in the city of Shantiniketan [name as received], West Bengal State.

The prime minister refuted allegations in the West that there are Indian soldiers in Afghanistan. He said that not a single Indian soldier is taking part in the conflict.

The prime minister stressed that after the administration of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto came to power in Pakistan the normalisation of India-Pakistan relations became possible. But Islamabad's support of terrorists in the Indian state of Punjab, unsettled questions about the border in the Kashmir region and Pakistan's nuclear programme create serious worries and prevent improvements in relations.

It is obvious that Pakistan's nuclear programme is aimed at developing an atomic bomb, Gandhi said.

2 Pakistanis Sentenced to Jail in Afghanistan

LD0604171589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; A. Shkirando video report]

[Text] [A. Shkirando] Two members of Pakistan's special services—Muhammed Ashraf Bashir, aged 35, who was brought into Afghanistan along a special branch line, and Muhammad Afzal, aged 26, who was fulfilling the tasks of the Pakistani military intelligence—appeared before a special state security court of the Republic of Afghanistan. However, even during the investigation of the defendants, it became clear that it was not just a case of espionage and subversive activity by these two Pakistanis. The facts cited by the Afghan competent bodies and also the personal evidence of the Pakistani intelligence officers—albeit former ones—are evidence of the fact that Pakistan has commenced widescale armed interference in to the affairs of Afghanistan.

On more than one occasion during the session of the court, the defendants also referred to the instructions by the initiators of this interference—Aslam Beg, army chief of staff of Pakistan, and Hamid Gul, head of military intelligence.

Muhammed Ashraf Bashir and Muhammed Afzal confirmed that more than 100 members of their kind operate in various Afghan provinces. The tasks which are set for them may vary somewhat, but there is only one objective: To create conditions for overthrowing the present regime in Afghanistan.

The defendants said that after dressing in Afghan national costumes, they were involved in collecting secret information on security posts and on government troop strengths, photographing secret facilities, and they also trained the insurgents to use those kinds of weapons which are rapidly arriving from Pakistan, in particular from Peshawar and Quetta.

The Pakistani intelligence officers operated in various regions of Afghanistan, but the province of Qandahar was the last point of their subversive activity against the national sovereignty of Afghanistan.

By the decision of the special state security court of the Republic of Afghanistan, Muhammad Afzal was sentenced to 16 years and Muhammed Ashraf Bashir to 18 years imprisonment. [Video shows trial, two men giving evidence with two soldiers in the background, occasional clip of the audience, journalists present, the tribunal, a man reading a sentence]

Pakistani Politician Cited on Afghanistan

LD0604123289 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Islamabad April 6 TASS—"War cannot produce a settlement of the situation in Afghanistan. It is only fraught with the danger of spreading to the territory of Pakistan", Abdul Wali Khan, chairman of the People's National Party of Pakistan and member of the country's National Assembly, told pressmen in Rawalpindi. At present, he stressed, there is a concrete chance to resolve the Afghan problem by political means on the basis of the Afghan leadership's proposals to include leaders of the armed opposition in the country's government.

According to Abdul Wali Khan, the present Pakistan Government treats Afghanistan as its own province, interferes in its domestic affairs. Referring to pronouncements by ministers of the so-called "mojadeen transition government," he also pointed out that the opposition received profuse amounts of the most diverse weaponry through Pakistan territory.

One of the main obstacles to the normalization of the situation in Afghanistan, according to the chairman of the People's National Party of Pakistan, is absence of even a semblance of accord amongst the leaders of the armed opposition. He said that these contradictions were so deep that there was practically no hope for a common policy to be drawn up.

Afghan Foreign Minister Ends Moscow Visit

LD0704075289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0640 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—'Abdul Wakil, foreign minister of the Republic of Afghanistan, who was on a stopover here en route from Kabul, flew from Moscow to New York today.

He was seen off at the airport by Boris Chaplin, USSR deputy foreign minister, and also by Sayyed Muhammad Gulabzoy, ambassador of the Republic of Afghanistan to the USSR.

Communist Party Delegation Visits Syria

Received by Ba'th Party Official

LD0504174289 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 5 Apr 89

[Text] Damascus April 5 TASS—On Wednesday Abdallah al-Ahmar, deputy general secretary of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (Ba'th) received a CPSU delegation led by CPSU CC [Central Committee] member, first secretary of Belgorod Region CPSU Committee A. Ponomarev. The delegation is staying here at the invitation of the Ba'th Party leadership.

During a conversation held in a friendly atmosphere they touched on some issues of the relations between Syria and the Soviet Union, of the international situation and the situation in the Middle East.

Abdallah al-Ahmar praised the consistent Soviet policy of working tirelessly for equal participation of all states, big and small, in international affairs. The sides stressed the important role which the social and political forces are called upon to play in resolving regional conflicts.

The guests gave an account of the notable work pursued by the CPSU to implement the large-scale programme of changes in the Soviet Union. Adballah al-Ahmar wished the CPSU, its leadership and all Soviet people every success in the restructuring drive.

During the conversation the sides expressed their mutual satisfaction with the present status of the development of Soviet-Syrian cooperation.

Accord Signed

LD0704065389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0542 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Damascus, 7 Apr (TASS)—A plan for ties between the CPSU and the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party for the years 1989-90 was signed here. It envisions further developing cooperation between the two parties in various spheres and consolidating existing experience; it maps out new horizons in interparty exchange.

The document was signed during the continuing visit to Syria of a delegation of CPSU workers headed by A.F. Ponomarev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the belgorod oblast committee of the CPSU.

The sides noted that one more important step has been taken in the area of expanding mutual ties. This is of principal significance for the consolidation of friendship between the two countries and peoples. The document envisions the exchange of delegations; assistance to the Syrian side in the training of party cadres; the familiarization of the aktiv of Arab Socialist ba'th Party with the process of restructuring which is taking place in the Soviet Union; and a search for new effective forms of party cooperation.

Shamir's Continued 'Intransigence' Criticized

18070200 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Vitaliy Gan: "Outbreak of Activity"]

[Text] Washington April 4—This week the Near East is becoming the focus of activity by the Bush administration. Talks between the U.S. President and President H. Mubarak of Egypt, here on an official visit, have been completed at the White House.

A conversation between Bush and Prime Minister I. Shamir of Israel is scheduled for Thursday. The present round of Near East diplomacy is crowned by a visit to Washington by King Hussein of Jordan on 17 April.

This outbreak of American activity is officially attributed to the firm desire to get the stalled process of searching for a peaceful settlement in the Near East moving. Unofficially, Washington sources admit that the point is to at least neutralize a productive trip to the countries of the region by E. A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs. Reports that the mood in favor of holding an international conference on the Near East under the aegis of the permanent members of the UN Security Council has been considerably reinforced in the Arab world as a result of talks with the Soviet minister caused much concern on the Potomac.

Thus far, Washington has not been able to make any constructive suggestions, though it is commonly noted here that the course of events in the Near East calls for the administration to devise a strategy with a view to settling this most tangled and potentially most dangerous regional conflict. According to the "line of behavior" which has become known, President Bush and Secretary of State Baker want first to hear the ideas of all three of their guests. Then experts of the administration intend to pick out the aspects on which consensus among the Arabs and the Israelis is at least theoretically possible, or estimate chances for overcoming differences.

The understanding of the deficiency of the unbalanced approach by Washington to the Near East is now apparent in the American press, perhaps, more than ever before. They hardly fail to understand in the White House that only the obstructionist stance of Tel Aviv stands in the way of real progress in the search for a fair political settlement to the conflict. The statements of the Israeli prime minister quoted at present essentially rule out any possibility of compromise. No to talks with the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, which the PLO is recognized to be throughout the world. No to the creation of an independent Palestinian state, no to the liberation of the occupied Arab territories.

As the newspapers testify, Shamir is taking such intransigence with him to Washington. To be sure, in order to cover up its odious nature, he is going to announce a "peace initiative" offering to the Palestinians elections in the West Bank of the Jordan River and in Gaza...in return for a discontinuation of the civilian uprising, the "intifadah." It is obvious that this is a stillborn idea because it merely provides for a new form, the content being old.

It appears that Tel Aviv itself does not attach much hope to the success of its maneuver. Perhaps it is no accident that, according to reports, Shamir is planning to lay almost the main stress on personal meetings with the U.S. Congress in an attempt to block any threat of using the $3 billion in aid to Israel to bring pressure to bear on him in order to provide for "greater tractability."

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopians Begin To Reject Separatism

PM3103150989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Mar 89 First Edition p 3

[Captain Second Rank V. Kocherov article under the rubric "Observer's Notes": "From Grainfield to Battlefield"]

[Text] Two short reports from Ethiopia somehow got lost in the stream of the first spring reports from abroad concerning international events. Both are devoted to statements which appeared almost simultaneously: from the separatists, and from the peasants' association. The first, reported by REUTER, stated that the separatists intend to form their own government in the regions controlled by them in the north of the country. The second, disseminated by TASS, told of the 14th anniversary of the adoption of the Decree on the Nationalization of Agricultural Land and the determination of the association's peasants to make the country self-sufficient in foodstuffs.

Despite the clear difference in topics, the link between the statements is very direct, for they essentially concern one and the same subject—land. The difference lies only in the attitude toward it of each of the two opposing forces in the country— the people led by the Workers

Party of Ethiopia [WPE], and the separatists united in two main groupings—the Tigray People's Liberation Front (Ethiopia) [TPLF] and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF].

We must not be deceived by the word "people's" in the imposing names of the TPLF and the EPLF, for it is nothing more than camouflage. The people, who are concerned about their daily bread, do not care about "frontline" associations. They know very well that not the rifle but the plow is their weapon in the struggle against famine, which, owing to the extremely severe droughts over a number of recent years, really threatens their country. But how else, if not by the "people's" symbol, can it be proved to the West that separatist ideas enjoy universal support in Ethiopia? So, in order to avoid losing financial aid from their foreign patrons, the leaders of the groupings are trying to do everything possible to tear the people away from the grainfields and direct their concerns to the battlefield.

To the battle for what?

The history of Ethiopian separatism, which is closely tied with the Eritrean problem, partly suggests an answer to this question. In 1962 Emperor Haile Selassie made Eritrea, which was previously united with Ethiopia on federal principles, a province of the country. So before 1974, before the national-democratic revolution, the Eritreans' struggle for their independence was understandable and explicable. Later, after the revolution, this movement, which at first involved a significant number of illiterate people (before 1974 93 percent of people in Ethiopia could neither read nor write), was used by a number of Western special services against the people's power.

Fierce fighting in the provinces of Tigray and Eritrea continues to this day. But, it seems to me, recently the rejection of separatism in the country has begun to grow noticeably. The Ethiopian people are increasingly actively joining in the struggle against it together with the armed forces. I think that this is connected primarily with the notable successes of the WPE and the country's government in the sphere of social policy and with widespread work among the population to explain the aims and tasks of the people's democratic state.

The change in the nature of the information which has been coming from Ethiopia recently testifies to this. Whereas before correspondents of Western agencies, primarily REUTER, day after day reported mainly the victories of the so-called rebels, now the teletype machiness more often bring reports of a different kind. Thus it became known recently that workers, peasants and representatives of Eritrea's other social strata had gathered 216 quintals of foodstuffs to assist the Second Revolutionary Army, and the inhabitants of the Bale region had sent the soldiers 3,800 birrs. A few days ago about 30,000 young men and women in the country declared their readiness to defend it. Whereas before many men in Eritrean and Tigray villages raised by the separatists submissively joined their ranks, now they are increasingly beginning to repulse them.

Those who just a few years ago were themselves in their own people's enemy camp are also laying down their weapons. Edris Seyid [name as transliterated], who was described as a former ELF-PLF (Eritrean Liberation Front-People's Liberation Front) commander, recently stated on Ethiopian television that the EPLF fighters are committing brutal crimes against the inhabitants of the Eritrean valley and bear the main blame for the Eritrean Muslims' enforced emigration. "Some 750,000 Eritreans living abroad are willing to fight alongside the Ethiopian Army against the EPLF in defense of Ethiopia's integrity," he stated. Another former member of the ELF-PLF Supreme Command, Ebrakhim Yasin [name as transliterated], said in an interview to Ethiopian journalists that his compatriots are convinced that the new Ethiopian constitution guarantees rights and equality for all the country's nations and nationalities.

The Ethiopian state also guarantees other democratic rights. The first session of the Ethiopian National Assembly in the fall of 1987 granted autonomous status to Eritrea. But the separatists did not lay down their weapons. Their aims are the same as before—to split the state and to wreck the plans for its people's peaceful life. And the latest statement by the EPLF and TPLF leaders, who intend to set up their own government in the regions they have seized in the north of the country, leaves no doubt on this score.

The other statement, that of the peasants' association, which set itself the noble task of providing the country with foodstuffs, expresses profound understanding of the obvious fact that it is not battles for land, which have already cost the lives of hundreds of peasants, but concern for the land that is the real way to save people from famine, which, as people in Ethiopia know only too well, is worse than death.

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev London Guildhall Speech

Ceremonies Precede Speech

LD0704100189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0950 GMT on 7 April broadcast a live relay from Guildhall in London. Mikhail Gorbachev, Raisa, and Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher are seen sitting in the front row of the auditorium. They all rise as the Soviet national anthem is played.

At 0954 GMT, the lord mayor takes the podium to welcome Gorbachev.

At 0957 GMT, Gorbachev walks to the podium and begins speaking.

British Leaders in Attendance

LD0704100689 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London March 7 TASS—The meeting at Guildhall, the London City Council, was one of the most important events of the last day of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Great Britain. It was attended by British leaders, representatives of the country's public and business cirlces.

A speech is being delivered there by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Gorbachev Speech

LD0704114189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0957 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Speech by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the 7 April meeting at Guildhall, the London City Council—live]

[Text] Ladies and Gentlemen:

I know [words indistinct] the people of Britain and, on behalf of my people, to express respect for a nation that has given the world great writers, scientists, artists, historians and philosophers, without whom it is hard to imagine European culture; a nation of renowned seafarers, inventors, workers and engineers, without whom it is hard to imagine modern civilization; a nation that has enriched world history with its political experience.

[London BBC Television Network in English at 0956 GMT on 7 April, which also broadcasts Gorbachev's Guildhall speech—live, with a superimposed English translation, renders the preceding paragraph as follows: "I know that it is a great honor indeed in Great Britain for a foreign official to speak from the rostrum of London's Guildhall. I appreciate the responsibility that I am assuming in addressing the entire British people. So, speaking from this historic place with age-old traditions, I wish in the first instance to extend greetings to the people of Britain and, on behalf of my own people, to express respect for the nation that has given the world great authors, scientists, artists, historians, and philosophers without whom European culture would be inconceivable indeed; the nation of famous seafarers, inventors, workers, and engineers without whom modern civilization would also be inconceivable; the nation whose political experience has enriched the history of the world."]

From this rostrum I am gratified to pronounce that important and positive changes are taking place in the relations between our two countries. They are amassing the potential for trust, and it seems to me that they have good prospects.

Ladies and gentlemen, this very building, with which so many events are connected, gives rise to thoughts about historical continuity. The 20th century is coming to an end, a century that has been stormy and very rich in events, and which has come to be a real turning point in the history of mankind. And there are probably few people who are not now wondering: What is to happen next? What lies beyond this point? In recent years a feeling of responsibility and of the moment through which we are living has become ubiquitous. It is linked with hope but is also burdened with anxiety. The world community has reached the crossroads of two kinds of politics. One, in generalized terms, is the politics of force. It comes from the past. The other kind of politics is still only taking shape. It stems from the rapid process of crystallization, integrity, and interdependence of the world. Its imperative is the primacy of interests and values common to all mankind.

Just recently Soviet people felt this to the highest degree in the solidarity with which the world responded to the Armenian earthquake. We sincerely thank the government and people of Great Britain and all citizens who took our misfortune closely to heart, expressed their sympathy, and rendered support.

The present generation of politicians has had to shoulder the burden of a most responsible choice, the burden of decisions of a destiny-shaping scale. No one has the moral right to opt out. We in the Soviet Union have started with ourselves. Four years ago, in April 1985, we made our choice, setting before ourselves the most difficult questions, and we tried to give honest and direct answers to them. We attempted to interpret our own experience, our own history, the world that surrounds us, and our position in it. We firmly embarked on the road of overcoming ossified dogmas and habitual blueprints and stereotypes. The results were restructuring and a new thinking, and a domestic and foreign policy that were based on them.

Since a country such as the USSR was involved, this generated uncommon interest everywhere, and it had an impact on the international atmosphere and the real political situation in the world. Hundreds of books and thousands of articles, official and learned reports, and papers and discussions at seminars and conferences and on radio and television programs have been devoted to our restructuring. Interest in our restructuring is not waning to this day and, as I understand it, you are hoping to hear from me what the situation is today, how restructuring will proceed further, and what its chances are.

So, you see, restructuring is in earnest and for the long term, and no one can now manage to turn it back. The people have firmly linked their destiny with restructuring.

The elections of USSR people's deputies, which took place in democratic conditions unprecedented in our whole history, showed that Soviet people do not intend to swerve from the path chosen 4 years ago. That ferment

of passions and opinions, that explosion of interest in social and state affairs, the striving to make the maximum use of glasnost and protect it, the very contradictoriness of judgments and suggestions, the concern to ensure that words should never again be at odds with deeds—all this is both a fundamental achievement of restructuring and evidence of the mass support it enjoys. At these elections the CPSU received strong support from the people. We embarked upon restructuring with our eyes open. We foresaw the difficulty and the unusual nature of this process and understood that it would entail a thorough shake-up for all society. In general, we were not mistaken.

It is another matter that the scale of many internal, political, economic, social, and moral aspects did not become evident right away, but instead in the course of the process that had been started. This demands more and more fresh approaches and solutions, and most strenuous intellectual and practical work. As regards the difficulties, which do indeed exist, we regard them as the natural expression of the contradictions of a transitional perioid. None of these difficulties is evidence of the erroneousness of the concept of restructuring itself. The difficulties merely stress the crucial nature of the moment through which we are living, when the old is still alive and cannot be removed in one fell swoop, and when the new cannot yet be set in motion at full power.

In this situation, problems and difficulties are inevitable, for what is involved here are profound transformations in everything—in the way of life, in the attitude toward labor, and to one's civic duty.

We have finally and irrevocably chosen the route toward new forms of life, the democratization of society in everything. We are convinced that it will create and is already creating conditions for complete self-expression of the personality and freedom of thought, and that it alone will make it possible to reveal originally the values inherent in socialism from the beginning such as social protection, justice, and humaneness in production and human relations. In doing so we are guided by the very highest standards of glasnost and of informing people, both internationally recognized standards and standards ensuing from our ideals and cultural and historic traditions. We are convinced that only through democratization is it possible to create a smoothly functioning, healthy, dynamic economy.

The radical economic reform, combining planning regulation with the market, will lead us to a new economic mechanism, will make it possible to harmonize the diversity of forms of socialist ownership and economic activity, and will give scope for the initiative and entrepreneurship of the producers.

We have drawn up a new agrarian policy. It is about scrapping the administrative command system in agriculture. Through various forms of leasing terms, the status of the peasant-master—his right to manage the land, the means of production, and the products of his labor—is being restored. The decision is of fundamental importance, not only for agriculture but also for the social and economic development of the country as a whole, for the concept itself of the development of our society.

Despite the fact that in the last 4 years society has changed extraordinarily, despite the obviousness of the fact that we are already living in a different spiritual and political atmosphere, in a different historical rhythm we nevertheless believe that we are still at the start of the road. Restructuring requires time, patience, persistence, and a constant search.

We know that serious trials still await us. There are problems connected with the lack of political culture, with the fact that the protection mechanisms for the functioning of democracy and for guarding it against destructive, antisocial actions have not yet been rehearsed. Weakness here is impermissible because it can impede the very process of democratization. We have much to do in the sphere of relations between nationalities, and we will do it in the process of adapting our federated state to the processes underway in Soviet society. Our basic principle is that a strong center and strong republics reflect the will of our peoples. A powerful lever in solving all these problems and implementing all our initiatives is the reform of the political system. So we are creating an open, democratic, free society, one that has mastered the lessons of its past, a society relying on law, on responsible and informed citizens, on their initiative and enterprise, on Soviet socialist patriotism and loyalty to the choice of humane socialism, the meaning of which is the elevation of humanity.

Ladies and gentlemen, restructuring in the USSR is a profound and fundamental process that responds first and foremost to the requirements of the internal development of our country. But it also contains traits of the changes characteristic of the whole contemporary world. Restructuring, by its very nature, is contradicted by self-isolation. At the same time, we are pleased to note that it is a beneficial factor on the international scene. The democratization of Soviet society is following the course of confirming democratic norms of openness in international affairs. The line of building our country into a state based on law coincides with a trend toward enhancement of the role of law in interstate relations. Our economic reform presupposes a deeper involvement of the USSR in the world economy and clearly can promote the formation of a truly world market and a new world economic order.

Over the past few years a real possibility has appeared for closing the final page of postwar history and stepping into a new period of peace. Gambling on strength is a dangerous position leading to deadlock. Contemporary realities have exposed the untenability of the philosophy of confrontation. The decades of the cold war cost too much both to East and West. The continuation of total

confrontation may turn into a catastrophe for everyone. Such is the objective logic of world politics at its current stage. It is by its laws that our new political thinking is being built.

Its fundamental principles and practical conclusions were set out in general terms at the UN General Assembly in New York. I would at this point just like to recall that the principled, long-term line of Soviet foreign policy and a draft of specific actions were expressed there.

We are inviting everyone to a dialogue of interaction for the sake of survival and progress. One may read in the papers every day now about the dangers and most acute problems common to all mankind. I would just like to point out a simple fact, one that sometimes escapes our attention. They are all interconnected. This knot cannot be cut with one blow, but it can be untied. And this common cause must not be put off.

We will not achieve genuine and profound disarmament if, at the same time, we do not fumdamentally change the political climate on the planet. We will not be able to save the environment if we do not embark on the path of disarmament and release means to solve ecological problems. We will not improve the situation throughout the world without achieving changes in North-South relations. We will not extinguish the centers of famine; we will not be able to deal with drug addiction and AIDS; we will not conquer terrorism; and we will not be able to do away with the trampling upon individuals and entire peoples until we acknowledge the fact that all this concerns all of us, and until we rise above a narrow egoistic understanding of our own interests and draw up guidelines of international interaction, taking present-day requirements into consideration.

The experience of recent years enables one to speak about the possibilities of a peaceful order, built on the principles of freedom of choice and a balance of interests, in conditions of a reduction in weapons arsenals and a lowering of military confrontation. We are proving this, and will continue to prove it by deeds.

As I have already had occasion to say, in the course of the 1989-90 period the Armed Forces will be reduced by 500,000 men—that is, by 12 percent of their overall number. The military budget will be reduced by more than 14 percent, and the production of armaments by nearly 20 percent. We have already embarked on the practical implementation of this program.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that we recently adopted a decision to end this year the production of highly enriched uranium for military purposes. In addition to the industrial reactor for the production of weapons-grade plutonium, which was closed down in 1987, we plan this year and next to close down two more such reactors, and we will not replace them with new capacities. This is yet another great step toward a complete end to the production of fissionable material for weapons.

Elimination of chemical weapons is one of the most important problems of demilitarization of international politics. We value the position of Great Britain, which eliminated these weapons unilaterally and was the first to suggest that the question ought to be debated by an international conference. Our bilateral cooperation is not bad. [London BBC TV English version renders the preceding sentence as follows: "Our bilateral cooperation has been quite good in this respect."] Our experts paid a visit to the British scientific and research center at Porton Down and yours visited our center.

We have completed the construction of a facility to destroy chemical weapons and we intend to invite your representatives there soon. The USSR will persist in its striving to attain as speedily as possible the conclusion of a comprehensive international convention completely banning and eliminating chemical weapons. We have made several important decisions to convert military production. A considerable proportion of the defense industry's works and design offices and the scientific research potential linked to them have been switched to the production of consumer goods, machines, equipment, and other goods for the agrarian sector and the light and food industries. A considerable proportion of military transport aviation is being transferred to goods transport for the national economy.

The USSR has taken several major steps in the direction of openness with regard to its military activities. We have already said that we would soon publish data about our military budget. The new USSR Supreme Soviet will deal with this. The difficulty is that the nonconvertibility of the ruble impedes an objective comparison between our expenditure and the West's military expenditure. We are looking for a most adequate way of presenting our data.

As for the Armed Forces' numerical strength, I can, already at this stage, report the following: As of 1 January this year it amounted to 4,258,000 men, including 1,596,000 infantry troops and 437,300 Navy personnel, with the remainder consisting of the missile troops, air defense troops, the air force, and the operational and material-technical logistics forces. As a result of a unilateral reduction of our Armed Forces, their total numerical strength will, by the end of 1990, amount to approximately 3,760,000 men. To provide a comparison: The total numerical strength of the U.S. Armed Forces, including the National Guard—in our country similiar components comprise a part of the Armed Forces—is more than 3 million men. Also, the number of personnel in the U.S. Naval Forces is more than double that of the USSR. We have published data on the military potentials of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO in

Europe. They show an approximate parity. If one compares the military forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, overall, taking into account the strategic nuclear forces, then the data for the Warsaw Treaty Organization are as follows: 5.3 million men, 10,500 aircraft, 4,200 combat helicopters, 80,000 tanks, and 160 large surface vessels. In all of these indices, apart from tanks, NATO exceeds the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Thus, the fears about a Soviet military threat are groundless.

The main highway toward reducing military confrontation and lowering arms levels and the burden of military expenditures leads through negotiations and seeking compromises between the main participants in the lengthy arms race. [London BBC TV English version renders the preceding sentence as follows: "Negotiations and a search for compromise between major countries involved in the protracted arms race would clear the way to a reduced level of military confrontation, fewer weapons, and a less onerous burden of military expenditures."] In this sense, the Vienna document and the start of talks on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe and on confidence-building measures are unprecedented events in the nuclear age.

The USSR is prepared to go a very long way in the demilitarization of Europe and in the European process in general. On all questions of the final document of the Vienna meeting we are ready to conduct a dialogue in the most constructive manner and to cooperate with Great Britain.

As is known, we are against unjustified linkages in disarmament matters. We do not make the reaching of agreement on one question dependent on a decision on a different question, but this is more a problem of organization of the negotiating process. Objectively, our age is linked in everything. Of course, there should be no doubt that if, for example, NATO gives the go-ahead for the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons, this cannot but affect the course of the Vienna talks, confidence-building measures, and the whole situation in Europe. It cannot but devalue much that was achieved under the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. In this connection, I consider it apt to recall once again that Britain's voice facilitated creation of the necessary conditions for concluding this treaty.

We are resolutely opposed to any plan for the modernization of nuclear weapons. We ourselves are not engaged in this and do not intend to engage in it unless we are forced to. I think common sense will prevail. We are convinced that the time has come to begin talks on reduction of the naval forces of the USSR and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Alliance. The issue of a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. arsenals of strategic offensive weapons remains at the top of the agenda of our relations with the United States. We are ready to resume talks at any moment.

With regard to the doctrine of deterrence [sderzhivaniye], I believe it is now time to speak not of deterrence with the aid of nuclear weapons, but of restraining [sderzhivaniye] nuclear weapons themselves. This signifies a renunciation of the stockpiling and refining of them, and a gradual but steady destruction of reserves, right up to full elimination and a production ban. We believe that a secure nuclear-free world is really attainable, and, naturally, the path to it lies not just through increasing openness and reliable verification, but also in confidence-building, which depends on many aspects of present-day international life. A considerable contribution to this can be made by Soviet-British relations. They hold an extraordinary political and historical potential, supplemented by a factor that is becoming increasingly important at present: Both states are permanent members of the UN Security Council. Given that they are constructively pooled together, our efforts do not merely add up, but multiply as an international factor. Conferences on humanitarian problems and human rights could become a major breakthrough to new expanses of the European process. The first among them will be the London Information Forum in just a few weeks, and the final one will be the Moscow conference in 1991. We can see coincident elements in the approaches of the USSR and Britain to the settlement of regional conflicts, and there is a certain experience here, and—this is the main factor—a readiness among the leadership of the two countries, calmly and in a businesslike way, to seek and propose to the sides concerned their own ideas and good offices.

We favor using Soviet-British dialogue to internationalize the economic problems of today's world. Here you cannot get by with an Areopagus of a few, though influential figures: Everyone has the right to take part in what concerns each. Only by common efforts, in conditions of equality, is it possible to avoid catastrophic shocks in the world economy. And they may come if we postpone the quest for a radical and just solution and set our hopes on palliatives.

In the sphere of ecology, the Soviet Union will act strictly within the framework of existing agreements and international programs and will soon join those of them in which it has not yet taken part. Here, too, I think, there is great potential for enriching Soviet-British relations. I am coming to a close. There are good changes taking place in our relations. Our two governments have travelled a long road to ensure that this should come about. We pay tribute to the efforts and persistence of the prime minister of Great Britain, Mrs Margaret Thatcher. Of course, in politics it is not all so easy. There remain substantial differences and disagreements. There may also be complexities in putting into practice those things on which we reached agreement yesterday at Downing Street. But it seems to me that we outlined the right guidelines. The range of trust has expanded. We became even more convinced that we can operate in the spirit of mutual understanding and productively, while protecting national interests in the framework of universal

values of contemporary civilization. And the fact that we are different is an incentive for exchanges, for cooperation, for dialogue between our states and peoples.

With these feelings we are returning to Moscow, taking away with us many impressions of your capital and of the people we managed to see in that short time. Our stay in your country will end with a visit to the queen of Great Britain.

I wish those present in this hall and all who are listening to me and all British families happiness, prosperity, and peace. All the very best. Thank you. [prolonged applause]

Reportage on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meetings

Talks Begin

LD0604164289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [V. Zorin, correspondent] The official Soviet-British summit-level talks began today. It is 1000. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrives at No 10 Downing Street, the residence of the head of the British Government. In spite of the tedious drizzle that started during the night, Thatcher meets Mikhail Sergeyevich at the entrance to the residence. The journalists who have received passes ask for a minute for photographs. [video shows limousine arriving at No 10, Thatcher and Gorbachev posing in doorway, photographers at work]

The applause with which employees of the government residence are welcoming Mikhail Sergeyevich is something unusual here. On the way to the room where the talks will be held, Margaret Thatcher tells her guest about some of the objects of note in the British prime minister's residence—quite a few such objects have been accumulated over the centuries. [video shows Thatcher and Gorbachev indoors, proceeding down aisle formed by two files of applauding officials; Thatcher pointing out pictures on walls to Gorbachev]

The talks, which will be held in a small group, will begin in a few minutes. As has been said, the leaders of the two countries will discuss a wide range of issues, among them the international significance of the restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union, a range of problems connected with East-West relations, including disarmament and the situation in Europe, and a number of other problems of paramount important. The talks have begun. [video shows Thatcher and Gorbachev posing in armchairs, policemen patrolling outside prime minister's residence]

Thatcher Comments After Talks

LD0604144189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1401 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London 6 Apr, (TASS)—Special correspondents report:

After the Soviet-British talks ended and the documents were signed, Margaret Thatcher and Mikhail Gorbachev made brief statements to the correspondents assembled.

This morning, the British prime minister stated, we had extremely substantial talks for 2 and a ½ hours on all the main issues of the current situation. Mikhail Gorbachev has fully informed me about the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union. We have discussed relations between East and West and arms reduction problems. We examined a wide range of regional questions, ranging from Central America to the Middle East. We have discussed the problems of Namibia. We are striving to ensure that the agreement reached has been fully implemented. We attended the ceremony of the signing of three agreements by our foreign ministers: on protection of capital investments, on improving the procedure for obtaining visas, and regarding the building of a school in Armenia with the funds collected by British citizens and entrepreneurs. The talks were of an in-depth, extensive, and very friendly nature. As always, we got down to tackling the essence of questions. I think this is a good example of the new spirit of amicability and cooperation in the process of East-West talks, Margaret Thatcher said.

Gorbachev Comments After Talks

LD0604152289 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 6 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made this statement following a meeting with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher here today:

I agree with what Mrs Thatcher said. I only differ with her on one point. Mrs Thatcher said we had talked for two and a half hours. I should say that we had talked since ten o'clock, without making a break even during lunch. But this is just a small footnote. I would like to take advantage of this occasion to thank Mrs Thatcher and her Government for their hospitality and convey the good wishes of all Soviet people to the people of Britain.

You know that my visit was to have taken place at a different time. Events in Armenia precluded that since I had to return urgently back to the USSR. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity also to express gratitude to both the government and the people of Britain for the feelings they showed to Armenian people, to Soviet people on those tragic days. I thank those Britons who came to Armenia and were directly involved in rescue operations during the first days after the disaster.

The tragedy demonstrated that we can reach out towards each other when there is mutual understanding and trust, when there is a good atmosphere in relations between us. What we discussed today in effect was precisely how to further the process of improving international relations.

We value dialogue with Britain, its government, with Mrs Thatcher. This dialogue has reached a very high level, it is substantive and, I should say, mutual understanding is improving.

This is why today we were able constructively to discuss various issues of world politics. They included disarmament, security, and regional conflicts. They also included our bilateral relations and many other issues. We shall continue our discussions and my impression is that the sphere of our cooperation is expanding. It is realistic dialogue and we welcome this development of Soviet-British relations.

Thatcher Speech at Official Dinner

LD0604201189 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Speech by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on 6 April at No 10 Downing Street official dinner for Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev; all quotation marks as received]

[Text] London April 6 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher gave an official dinner in honour of the visiting Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, and his wife in her London residence at No 10, Downing Street on Thursday.

Addressing the Soviet leader, Mrs. Thatcher said:

"It is a very great pleasure indeed to welcome you on this your third visit to our country, but for the first time to No 10 Downing Street, the home and office of prime ministers of this country for over 250 years.

It is, I have to say, a slightly more modest establishment than the Kremlin where you kindly greeted me during my visit two years ago.

We cannot match the majesty of St. George's Hall or the splendour of the Painted Hall where we dined with you.

Nonetheless, here in this house a great deal of our nation's history has been enacted, and now we welcome you, Mrs Gorbachev, and your delegation as a further chapter in that history. Although it is your third visit to Britain, you have come each time in a different capacity.

First in 1984 as a member of the Politburo.

Then in 1987 as general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party.

And now on this third visit as president.

You won't be surprised that we flatter ourselves that visits here are an excellent boost for career prospects.

But it is not just the offices which you hold that have changed.

In barely more than four years since your first visit, we have seen changes in the Soviet Union which can only be described as a peaceful revolution.

We admire—very much admire—the vision and the boldness which have inspired those changes. We do not for a moment underestimate the scale of the problems which remain to be overcome.

There will be setbacks: There always are.

People like to believe that the future is a promised land, which will arrive if you just sit and wait for it.

Of course it is not like that at all. It has to be earned by effort—not someone else's effort, but the effort of each and every person.

We believe you have been absolutely right to perceive, Mr General Secretary, that economic change can only come about as a result of political change. Economic change takes longer. But increasing freedom releases people's energies and inventiveness, brings new opportunities and responsibilities which have previously been denied.

It encourages them to exercise their own initiative rather than just wait for instructions.

Your recent elections were followed almost as closely in this country as in the Soviet Union. Public opinion was given the chance to express itself through a constitutional means and the results were exciting. Above all, they were a firm endorsement of your new thinking.

To us it seems that they brought out hitherto untapped qualities in the Soviet people. It is only through the exercise of democracy that perestroika will be made irreversible."

It requires a leader of great determination to carry out the most difficult task of all, that of changing attitudes. That is what you are trying to do, Mr General Secretary, and with all our mind and strength we want you to succeed.

There is an enormous fund of goodwill in this country for the Soviet people. You saw it in the response to the earthquake in Armenia and the great outpouring of goodwill and generosity which followed.

It is against that background that we also welcome the new thinking in your speech at the United Nations last December with its emphasis on freedom of choice and the need to seek negotiated solutions to conflicts.

There is now more confidence between East and West than when I visited Moscow two years ago:

—NATO has always been a defensive organisation which threatens nobody. Now we are encouraged by the new emphasis in the Soviet Union on what is called "sufficiency in defence" and by your proposals, Mr General Secretary, for unilateral reductions in Soviet forces;

—The INF agreement is being successfully implemented, and we are negotiating to reduce the conventional forces of both sides in Europe;

—You have carried out your promise to withdraw from Afghanistan;

—The five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council are increasingly working together;

—We are seeing progress towards solving some long-standing regional problems, for instance in southern Africa where I was a few days ago—and I pay tribute to the Soviet Union's role in securing agreement on Angola and Namibia. It is, of course, very important that all parties observe that agreement strictly. It matters for the whole future of southern Africa. And if only we can finally see an end to apartheid in South Africa, I believe that great country could become the motor for the economic development of southern Africa as a whole;

—We very much welcome the increase in the numbers of people allowed to leave the Soviet Union and the greater tolerance shown towards those who want to practise their religious beliefs;

—We welcome, too, your statement that class values have been succeeded by human values.

On so many things we increasingly see ourselves as citizens of one world, tackling together the great problems which affect us all.

All this we welcome and praise, Mr General Secretary.

We are by nature people who like to think the best of others, who want to return friendship with friendship, understanding with understanding.

We are not afraid of new ideas or new thinking.

But one thing we shall never do—and nor would you—is base our policies on wishful thinking rather than on reality.

It is on that basis that we have built such mutual respect.

Of course we welcome arms control agreements: But we look too at the weapons which remain and those which continue to be produced.

Of course we welcome the doctrine of sufficiency in defence.

But each side must always have regard to its global strategy and its capacity to defend itself in an unpredictable world. The belief in the fundamental right of each country to its security was one of the points we found in common when we first met at Chequers in 1984. But both our countries know from bitter experience that conventional weapons do not deter war in Europe, whereas nuclear weapons have done so for forty years.

As a deterrent there is no substitute for them. Of course we welcome greater openness: But we want to see it extended to military matters: We worry very much about chemical weapons and the difficulty about verifying the precise position.

We worry too about the proliferation and use of these weapons in the Middle East.

Of course we are pleased when families are reunited and those who want to emigrate can do so: But we also look forward to the changes in the law which you have promised, which will make these the rights of every person, so that they can be claimed and enforced and not given as privileges which can one day be taken away.

Of course we embrace the principle of freedom of choice, it is fundamental to our own society.

We want to see it fully applied in all aspects of national and international life.

We believe in peace, not peace at any price but peace with freedom and justice because only that brings the dignity and prosperity we seek.

We need to recognise honestly that establishing trust and confidence is a long process.

We shall need to proceed carefully and to negotiate honestly, making sure that at every stage both of us are secure.

We have made progress, great progress. Indeed things have become possible which were unthinkable when I became prime minister nearly ten years ago.

We have more contacts, more negotiations, more trade.

Relations between Britain and the Soviet Union are better now than they have been at any time since the Second World War.

Every move towards better understanding, every sign of willingness to work together, every step towards more democracy and human rights is a step in the direction of creating a better world for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. General Secretary, I hope you have felt the genuine warmth of this country's welcome for you and Mrs. Gorbachev, and the admiration and respect in which you are held as the leader of a great country.

We look forward to your speech at our ancient Guildhall tomorrow.

As we enter a new era, we wish you and the Soviet people success, prosperity and happiness."

In conclusion the British prime minister proposed a toast to the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Gorbachev Speech at Official Dinner

PM0704115589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at official dinner with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on 6 April at No 10 Downing Street: "Road to an All-European Home. Speech by M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] Esteemed Madam Thatcher,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Comrades,

The talks and other events of this day will, obviously, be subjected to a serious analysis by the leaders of both countries and, of course, by political and public circles and the international press. I am convinced that they deserve it.

I can say right now that our first contact established late in 1984 when we met Mrs Thatcher at Chequers proved to be very viable and promising.

With each new meeting—and this is the fourth one—the Soviet-British dialogue gains in substance and importance, not only in terms of our bilateral relations, but also in European and broader terms.

The fact that Madame Thatcher and I tell each other precisely what we mean to say builds a stable atmosphere of trust and enhances the predictability of our policies.

At the same time, our problems and differences assume clearer outlines. This alone makes it easier for us to tackle them.

All this is extremely important at the world's present turning point.

Our countries' growing interest in each other, earnest efforts to really sort out internal developments, broader contacts, discarding nonsensical stereotypes, a greater tolerance of differencs and peculiarities are combining to become the sign of the times and indicate that relations between states are growing more humane.

That means accommodating each other. And I believe that our restructuring and new thinking contribute to that end.

In the future, both in Soviet-British relations and in international relations in general, a great deal will depend on the West's correct assessment of our restructuring.

However we have noticed that as it becomes increasingly evident that Soviet society will undergo renewal according to its own choice, refusing to duplicate someone else's models, more vigorous attempts are made to discredit restructuring.

They say that restructuring is doomed to failure and the Soviet Union will roll back. The confrontational anti-Soviet syndrome arises again, as that syndrome served well for some people during the "cold war."

That wave, coming from well-known sources, will not knock us off the course we have chosen. As they say, we are "doomed" to succeed with our restructuring. And our great country has everything it needs to succeed.

The main outcome of the elections of people's deputies is that the people have voted for restructuring, and a more vigorous restructuring in the future. They have staked their future on it.

The attempts made in the West to sow mistrust in, and suspicions about, the goals and purposes of restructuring and to misrepresent its progress are aimed at torpedoing the efforts to improve international relations.

This is why here, in one of the capitals of the Western world, I am taking this opportunity to tell you what we think about it.

We advocate that progress in Soviet-British relations should naturally fit into the all-European process and, generally, the dialogue between nations in the East and West, and that this progress should be a permanent positive element in the movement of the world community to a new peaceful era.

It is a question of establishing an international political and legal order that would exclude wars, violence, intimidation, aggression, and expansion; that would imply unconditional respect for the freedom of choice, and be based on full equality of all and be favourable to a civilized coexistence of all nations and to their joint efforts to preclude global risks for life itself on earth. There is simply no other sensible option.

However, the problem is that quite a few people are still reluctant to give up their stereotyped perceptions of the rules of conduct in the world or criteria inherited from the past in assessing one's own actions and the actions of others.

In the course of radical restructuring and renewal of our society, we in the Soviet Union have generated a new unbiased vision of ourselves and the world surrounding us.

Last December from the UN rostrum we urged the world community to do the same.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our talks and meetings with Mrs Thatcher are not just discussions and arrangements on some specific issues, however important they may be. This is truly a dialogue, one that always addresses subjects of major philosophical importance and fundamental political problems.

My impression is that today we can say we understand each other better.

Underlying this outcome is the positive experience of a long history of relations between our two nations, in particular, between Britain and the Soviet state.

Underlying this outcome are also the lessons taught by the losses inflicted by enmity and hostility that marked whole years and even longer periods in our relations, which means we are able to draw conclusions from the past. And, this is not unimportant.

We are mindful of the fact that the British leadership was among the first in the West to discern the major approaching changes in the Soviet Union.

Now, too, we value the interest shown toward us, which is being translated into the development and enrichment of British-Soviet relations.

Certainly, there remain differences, which are sometimes not insignificant, in Soviet and British approaches to certain issues. Both in Moscow and in London this is taken into account. But both capitals seem to have learned not to dramatize the differences but rather continue to look for points of contact while sticking to one's own convictions. And this, too, is a sign of a new quality of our relationship.

I am a confirmed opponent of nuclear weapons and strongly advocate their total elimination. Mrs Thatcher perceives a good measure of romanticism in this approach. I cannot accept that: My position reflects the harsh realities of our time.

There are many difficulties along the road toward a nuclear-free world. Some interim stages will also be necessary. Nevertheless, it is our firm intention to work toward that goal.

The new climate in political relations promotes a situation where in business relations between our two countries as well there are signs of a turn toward greater mutual interest.

There is a no small number of problems in this field as well. We are aware of them, as you are, but restructuring impels us to tackle these problems looking for considered, sound, and long-term solutions.

In all areas we have much hard work to do. It is in our common interest to try to assure that our deeds are more eloquent about us than the loudest words.

In conclusion, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to Mrs Thatcher, to her colleagues and all those who accompanied us and assisted us today, for the consideration, cordiality, and hospitality we all enjoyed here, in your capital. I wish to propose a toast to the good health of the prime minister of Great Britain, Madame Margaret Thatcher, and Mr Dennis Thatcher, and to the development and expansion of relations between our two peoples and nations.

Gorbachev Tours London, Meets British Leaders

Tours British Firm

LD0604154889 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 6 TASS—By TASS special correspondents: The British business community is showing a special interest in the Anglo-Soviet summit in London.

The history of trade and industrial contacts between the two countries dates back to many decades ago but the current upswing has come after the long years of cold war, which have severely undercut these relations.

The contacts are now being resumed and joint ventures launched in most promising fields. But British businespeople are not yet satisfied with the pace that these relations have been developing at.

Brook Horowitz, a major machine-bulding company's manager for trade with the Soviet Union, agrees with most of his compatriots, for example, that overall, Anglo-Soviet relations "have never been better".

But Thatcher's desire "to do business" with Gorbachev, he adds, is yet to be matched by bilateral trade levels, which are still far from the target set during the Soviet-British meeting in Moscow in 1987.

Case Communications Manager T. Donovan believes, for his part, that many British businesspeople should not only note the insufficiently high levels of Soviet-British trade, but also actively help raise them.

And he lives up to his words. His firm, which was visited by Mikhail Gorbachev this afternoon, had prepared well for the occasion.

It had colourful booklets and other promotional material on computer communications printed in Russian in advance.

The firm's equipment is already being used in the USSR by the ministries of the merchant fleet, the gas industry and health.

The Soviet Government and ministries of nonferrous metallurgy and the medical and microbiological industries are demonstrating a desire to buy some of these newest date transmission facilities.

A group from Case Communications is going to come to Moscow later this month for a British trade festival.

Gorbachev toured the firm's premises and talked to its engineers and workers.

Meets British Businessmen

LD0604175189 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 6 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, in Great Britain on an official visit, met here today with a group of British businessmen.

The meeting at Lancaster house was organised by Secretary of State for Trade and Industry Lord Young and president of the Confederation of British Industry Sir Trevor Holdsworth.

They held an informal discussion on potentialities of expanding ties between British industrialists and Soviet enterprises.

Visits Westminister Abbey

LD0604154489 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 6 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

Visiting Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev toured the Westminister Abbey, a positive jewel of ancient English culture, this afternoon.

The Soviet guest, accompanied by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and her husband, Dennis, were welcomed by the Abbey's father superior, Michael Mayne.

The visitors paid their respects at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Gorbachev bowed as a tribute to the memory of Britons—both those who fell during World War II and those who together with Soviet troops liberated Europe from Nazism in the land and sea campaigns of the Second World War.

The Soviet leader placed a wreath at the tomb and signed the Honoured Visitors' book.

He was also shown around other parts of the abbey, including a cemetery with the graves of Longfellow, Newton, Darwin, Shakespeare, Burns and other world-famous British cultural personalities.

Meets Labour Party's Kinnock

LD0604232489 Moscow TASS in English 2302 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Aleksandr Yakovlev met at the Soviet Embassy in London on Thursday with the Labour Party leader, Neil Kinnock, and his deputy and "shadow" home secretary Roy Hattersley.

The meeting focused on issues of the importance of Soviet-British relations and of Mikhail Gorbachev's current visit to London for each country and the peace process in general.

Neil Kinnock set out the position of his party with regard to the Soviet perestroyka reform programme, which the Labour Party welcomes, along with the foreign policy related to it.

The interlocutors discussed some disarmament aspects and emphasized their negative attitude to the modernization of nuclear weapons and the security policy oriented to preserving nuclear weapons and the security policy oriented to preserving nuclear weapons. They stated that the dialogue between the two parties had a tendency towards partnership not only in international issues, but also in the issues of the world labour movement.

In this context, Mikhail Gorbachev and Neil Kinnock spoke in favour of the joint celebration by communists and socialists of the 100th anniversary of the 2nd international.

The meeting was also attended by Valentin Falin, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Soviet Ambassador to Britain Leonid Zamyatin.

Meets Queen Elizabeth

LD0704123289 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to meet the British head of state, Queen Elizabeth II, has concluded the Soviet leader's stay in Great Britain.

The monarch and her husband, the duke of Edinburgh, met the Soviet leader and his wife today at Windsor Castle.

After mutual greetings, the duke invited Gorbachev to inspect the honour guard. The head of the guard greeted the Soviet leader in Russian. The anthem of the Soviet Union was performed.

Gorbachev toured the castle after which the queen gave a lunch in honour of the esteemed Soviet visitor.

Invites Queen to Visit USSR

LD0704145189 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev disclosed at Heathrow Airport before flying home today that on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) he had invited Queen Elizabeth II of Britain to visit his country at any time convenient to her.

Seen Off by Thatcher at Heathrow

LD0704145689 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—A three-day visit to Britain of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has come to a close. A farewell ceremony was held at 1500 GMT at the Heathrow Airport. It was attended by a special representative of the queen, the lord chamberlain, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain and her husband Dennis Thatcher, British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Geoffrey Howe and other officials.

The guard of honour of Royal Air Force officers was lined up and the national anthem of the Soviet Union was performed.

Shevardnadze Meets UK's Howe in London

LD0604200589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1747 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London, 6 Apr (TASS)—On 6 April in the framework of the Soviet-British meeting at the summit level, thorough conversations took place between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister, and G. Howe, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. The ministers discussed specific problems of mutual interest concerning development of the international situation and bilateral relations.

The ministers had an in-depth discussion covering a broad range of questions relating to a settlement of regional situations involving conflict, while at the same time laying emphasis on broadening opportunities for the interaction between the two countries, including at the UN. Specifically, an exchange of views was held on the development of events in southern Africa.

The Soviet side raised the question of the Afghan problem and stressed the need for a full and consistent compliance by all sides with the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. A certain proximity of the two countries' positions was noted in the sphere of the insistent search for a just settlement in the Middle East, and efforts toward the beginning of the process of such a settlement.

E.A. Shevardnadze informed G. Howe on the development of Soviet approaches to problems concerning disarmament and strengthening international trust. At the same time, emphasis was put on the practical implementation of the measures for consolidating peace and security, conducive to the development of the provisions of the speech of M.S. Gorbachev at the UN.

In a thorough and specific way, the sides discussed questions concerning advancing along the path of disarmament, banning and eliminating chemical weapons, reducing conventional weapons, and strengthening military trust measures.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the favorable development of Soviet-British cooperation in the field of culture. For the purpose of enriching the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of contact between the peoples of the USSR and Great Britain, the ministers agreed to, and gave appropriate instructions for, speeding up preparations for a long-term agreement on cooperation, which includes opening cultural centers in the capitals of both countries.

The conversations were of a businesslike and frank nature. They were aimed at bringing together the viewpoints of the sides and attaining practical accords on questions discussed.

UK-USSR Agreements; Soviets Visit Marx Grave

PM0604154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev in London"]

[Excerpts] London, 6 Apr—[passage omitted] On 5 April the British capital welcomed M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who arrived here on an official visit.

E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, arrived in London with M.S. Gorbachev. [passage omitted]

The business part of the visit began already early this morning. About 300 representatives of the world's largest television companies, news agencies, and newspapers had already taken up positions outside the door to 10 Downing Street, residence of the British prime minister. This is the first time ever in the long history of this house that a Soviet head of state has taken part in government talks. And reporters are missing no chance to update the annals of Soviet-British relations, which have gathered new qualities and dynamism in the last few years.

M. Thatcher met M.S. Gorbachev at the residence door. They walked into the Fireplace Hall, had commemorative photographs taken, and then made their way to the prime minister's office for official talks.

A ceremony for signing Soviet-British documents later took place. The documents were signed by the two countries' Foreign Ministers E.A. Shevardnadze and G. Howe.

London spread out from the ancient Tower Hill and the fortress located on it to become one of the largest centers of world culture, an influential business crossroads, and a center of the international workers movement. Every corner here commemorates an event in the history of civilization. One such landmark is Highgate Cemetery where Karl Marx lies buried. Flowers were laid at K. Marx's grave on behalf of M.S. Gorbachev by members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet organization staffers, who are here in connection with the Soviet-British summit meeting. The ceremony was attended by A.S. Chernyayev, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; V.V. Tereshkova, chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries; USSR Ambassador to Britain L.M. Zamyatin; and representatives of the USSR Embassy and Trade Mission.

Yakovlev Meets UK Members of Parliament

LD0604233189 Moscow TASS in English 2320 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met at the British Parliament on Thursday with a group of leading MPs [members of Parliament] including the leaders and members of the House of Commons Foreign Policy Committee, the British group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Anglo-Soviet parliamentary group. An exchange of views took place on the issues of international policy, disarmament and Anglo-Soviet relations. Aleksandr Yakovlev replied to questions from British MPs.

A meeting took place between Aleksandr Yakovlev and speaker of the House of Commons Bernard Weatherill.

British Defense Secretary George Younger gave a lunch in honour of Aleksandr Yakovlev. Taking part in it were Valentin Falin, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, advisor of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Air Chief Marshal David Craig, chief of the defense staff, other politicians and military leaders.

Aleksandr Yakovlev also met leader of the Social Democratic Party David Owen.

Gerasimov Comments on Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks

LD0604182989 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] London April 6 TASS—The Soviet Union highly assesses Britain's role in European and international affairs and welcomes the expansion of political dialogue with this country, Soviet spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told newsmen at a briefing in the Soviet Press Centre in London today.

The Soviet official summed up the content of the discussion held by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in 10, Downing Street.

Thatcher showed profound interest in the course of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, Gerasimov said. "And she knows much about it. A considerable part of the discussion dealt with that subject."

Gorbachev frankly described successes and difficulties in the way of perestroyka, the spokesman said. Thatcher dissociated herself from those figures in the West who view perestroyka as a threat to the Western countries, stressing that these countries are not interested in the failure of perestroyka policies.

Soviet perestroyka is exerting influence on the entire system of present-day international relations, now in the state of change, it was noted. The latter part of the discussion was concerned with foreign policy issues in the light of this influence.

Regarding nuclear disarmament, the Soviet side stated that now that talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe have started in Vienna, the argument of nuclear war advocates to wait on nuclear disarmament until conventional arms are eliminated loses validity.

The significance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was emphasised, the Soviet spokesman said. For this important treaty to work, it is necessary to get rid of nuclear weapons, for nuclear powers pledged under terms of the treaty to work for nuclear disarmament.

The so-called modernisation of tactical nuclear weapons does not accord with the Vienna talks and looks as a detour complicating these talks, the Soviet side believes.

Gorbachev and Thatcher discussed issues of banning chemical weapons. In response to the British side's doubts about the Soviet chemical arsenals, Gorbachev stated the USSR's readiness to remove by way of consultations all possible reticences and misunderstanding.

"On the disarmament issue on the whole," Gerasimov said, "we can rightly expect that the West come up with an adequate response to our initiatives. We are prepared to discuss the subject of 'superiority'; we ourselves have questions.

"Why, for instance, does the West omit navies and air forces in estimating the correlation of forces?"

At present, when disarmament has started to materialise and has acquired a specific shape, it is important not to lose the momentum, the spokesman said.

In this connection, he remarked, one cannot but express surprise over the United States' slowness in defining its own foreign policy positions. Advancement in this area is impossible without cooperation with the United States.

In discussing regional conflicts, Gerasimov said, the interlocutors noted that their solution is becoming easier in an atmosphere of expanding international cooperation.

As an example, one can cite the solutions jointly found for southern Africa. Britain's support for the UN position played its positive part. Concerted actions make it easier to achieve positive results.

The Soviet-British political dialogue has attained a new high level as a result of the London meetings and contributed to better understanding between the two countries, Gerasimov said.

Soviet-British Dialogue 'Gaining Momentum'

LD0704112189 Moscow TASS in English 1101 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London April 7 TASS—By TASS correspondent:

The world press, which is rarely in complete accord on key problems of international life, has been practically unanimous this time and, judging by everything, has not erred in its forecasts. Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Great Britain has shown that the political dialogue between our two countries is gaining momentum, has furnished fresh evidence that contemporary interstate relations are changing.

It ought to be noted in this connection, that Margaret Thatcher was among the first, if not the first Western leader, who noticed the Soviet Union's evolution to a qualitatively new state. The prime minister of Great Britain backed the perestroyka policy not out of philanthropic considerations, of course. She was able to make out Britain's own interest in it. Decades of military and political confrontation with the Soviet Union, far from strengthening Britain's positions in the international arena, have caused substantial damage to her commercial and economic interests, endangered the country's security. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union, rightly understood by Margaret Thatcher, permitted her to reconsider the entire concept of relations with the USSR.

Every Soviet-British summit meeting promotes our bilateral dialogue, expands the areas of mutual understanding, consolidates mutual trust. Today, on the last day of Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Great Britain, it can be claimed without fear that the current meeting was no exception in this respect. Both leaders have confirmed this both in their brief press statements and in speeches delivered at Thursday's offical dinner.

The Soviet leader's speech at Guildhall, the London City Council, to the cream of British officialdom, business and cultural circles, will be one of the most outstanding events of today's programme and of the visit as a whole, for that matter.

Guildhall is a place of special pride for Londoners. It was built in 1440. Official receptions are given in its huge banquet hall on special occasions. Very famous is the Guildhall picture gallery and library, featuring original volumes of William Shakespeare's works.

The finishing touch to the current historical meeting in Soviet-British relations will be the reception in honour of Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva, which is to be given at a royal country residence at 1300 today by Queen Elizabeth the Second and her husband Prince Philip of Windsor. It was 22 years ago that the Queen of Britain had received a high Soviet guest for the last time. In February 1967 the queen gave a dinner at Buckingham Palace in honour of Aleksey Kosygin, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, who paid an official visit to Great Britain at the invitation of the British Government.

Mikhail Gorbachev will round off his official visit to Great Britain and return home later today.

News Conference Held Prior to Gorbachev Arrival

LD0604173889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Both the Soviet and British sides have added their own principles to the general concept of the integrity and interlinking of the European processes. It is important that the objective be a common one, and the new political thinking and a conscious desire to reject the stereotypes of the past have become the best means to achieve this. This conclusion also arises from what took place at a news conference in London which was held on the eve of Gorbachev's arrival by Shishlin, a senior official of the CPSU Central Committee, leading Soviet international affairs scholar Academician Primakov, and Zhurkin, a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Unidentified correspondent speaking over video of news conference and shot of Shishlin speaking] Anticipating the conversation with the correspondents, Nikolay Shishlin emphasized that both sides were defeated in the cold war. We need to seek ways for cooperation and trust, ways to tomorrow, while preserving freedom of choice.

Later replying to a question as to whether the Soviet Union hoped to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons within the timescale stipulated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement of 15 January 1986, Nikolay Shishlin replied:

[Begin Shishlin recording] The main thing about the Gorbachev plan is not the timescale but the objective. If the objective of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world is not achieved, then, of course, there will be nothing good in it. There is another important thing in this plan, and that is that this objective itself is attainable only through joint efforts. [end recording]

[Correspondent] Regarding the concept of a common European home, which was put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, a correspondent of THE ECONOMIST asked if this was just a message of goodwill or a specific program.

[Begin V.V. Zhurkin recording] The common European home is a continuation and a possibly new stage in the general European process, a process of security and cooperation in Europe, which, in the long term, should provide for an overcoming of the European divide and the creation in one form or another of an all-European system in which all the European states would participate on equal terms, although they would evidently belong to different social and political systems. In the sphere of security, sooner or later the question will evidently be raised about the military content of military-political blocs, i.e. NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, being blunted more and more. [end recording]

[Correspondent] A correspondent of THE GUARDIAN asked about the USSR's attitude to great Britain's position on nuclear weapons. Arkadiy Maslennikov answered him.

[Begin Maslennikov recording] A (?technical) analysis of this problem leads to the realization that at some stage, especially at the stage of the forthcoming reductions, if they can be achieved, in the Soviet and U.S. offensive arsenals, British nuclear forces could become a serious brake on progress in nuclear disarmament. We must keep this in mind, of course. [end recording]

[Correspondent] There were a number of questions concerned regional conflicts, in particular, a question was put to Academician Primakov in connection with President Bush's statement that he was in favor of an end to israel's occupation of the Arab lands.

[Begin Primakov recording] If Mr Bush's statement is a testimony of the United States' long-term line, aimed at convening a conference on the Middle East and at settling this problem, and aimed at encouraging contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization and at recognizing it as the representative of the palestinian people, then I think that this will undoubtedly help toward solving all the questions connected with this most protracted conflict in the world. The thing is statements are often made which are not reaffirmed by practical policy. [end recording]

Gorbachev-Thatcher UK Summit Previewed

PM0604180789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Morning Edition pp 1,4

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondents A. Krivopalov and M. Sturua: "The Fourth Meeting"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] A Soviet Press Center has been in operation for some days now in the Swallow Hotel on Cromwell Road in London. A group of prominent Soviet public figures, scientists, writers, and cultural representatives has come to participate in its work. Some of them were elected during the recent elections of people's deputies.

The first press conference, chaired by A. Grachev, center leader and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, was well attended. The various journalists were interested above all in the details of the resuls of the elections in our country. There were no "blank spots" in the Soviet representatives' discussion with the press. It was very frank.

V. Tereshkova, chairman of the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies; Academicians Ye. Primakov, V. Goldanskiy, and V. Trefilov; V. Zhurkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; N. Shishlin, consultant at the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; A. Ananyev, writer and chief editor of the journal OKTYABR; and the other Soviet representatives have met with journalists many times before.

We were also able to talk with our colleagues—British journalists. Many asked: Don't mutual recriminations about observance of human rights contradict the new character of relations between Britain and the USSR? But these problems have now become a kind of two-way street—there is no need to avoid them.

The human rights issue is well established on the agenda of East-West political dialogue. Life itself is constantly bringing it up. Many Britons have written to or called the IZVESTIYA correspondents' center in London drawing the Soviet paper's attention to the violation of human rights in the United Kingdom, particular in Ulster. Other cases were pointed out, for example, the "Birmingham Six" and "Guildford Four," wrongly convicted, in the opinion of many.

But you have to be able to distinguish mutual criticism—real criticism, based on concrete facts—from political games. It is hard for us to understand why British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe used the 40th anniversary of NATO to utter remarks that were clearly in the spirit of past times. He talked about the "Russian Bear" again, which apparently poses a military threat to the West.

In its time, Britain has been a significant contributor to the general enemy image obsession. The new times, however, have wrought considerable changes in the British mood. This is indicated, in particular, by a recent Mori poll. Its results were published in THE TIMES. The paper drew the following conclusion: "On the day of President Gorbachev's arrival in London, it has been made known that in the eyes of the British public the Soviet threat is considerably smaller than when he became leader."

Following are figures no less eloquent than THE TIMES' admission. Only 17 percent of those questioned believe USSR policy is harmful to Britain (27 percent in 1983, 42 percent in 1981). Some 76 percent of those polled believe that their country would be a safer place if all nuclear weapons were eliminated by the year 2000.

The Soviet Union and its allies consistently advocate reducing military confrontation in Europe between the two mighty blocs as far as possible and comprehensively expanding trade and economic relations between West and East and strengthening them on a new basis.

Trade and scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and Britain possess great potential that has not yet been fully explored. There are promising indicators here. In 1988 Soviet exports to this country increased by 20 percent compared to 1987. Goods exchange within the framework of production sharing and the creation of joint enterprises on Soviet and British territory is a promising channel for expanding ties. Last year 12 were set up, most of them industrial.

Positive results are expected at the Moscow British-Soviet Month, which includes trade, sports, and cultural events. Over 200 firms from the United Kingdom will be participating.

But there are other unavoidable elements. Although British businessmen are in favor of expanding mutually advantageous links with our country, mention must also be made of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls [Cocom] and other artificial barriers. The growth of Soviet-British trade is being inhibited by discriminatory measures introduced by the British authorities in relation to certain Soviet goods, and by the ban on the export of modern industrial equipment and the latest technology to the USSR.

To be fair, it must be said that we are also to blame for some things. The imbalance in our financial system, the instances of red tape that still occur, and the unobliging attitude toward the fulfillment of certain commitments must be mentioned here. Our working people's inadequate training sometimes has an adverse effect, too. All in all, there are things to think about and things to be pressed on with in this area in order to achieve—quantitatively and qualitatively—an improvement in Soviet-British trade, economic, and scientific and technical links.

The great French historian of the last century Jules Michelet, who lectured on British history at the College de France, began with the following words: "Britain is an island. Now you know as much about it as I do." Britain at the end of the 20th century is still an island, but that is geography, not politics, and not even psychology. Our world is now so small that no one has the right to live an isolated existence away from the topics of the day.

The West and the East are now moving further and further away from the familiar haunts of confrontation. The idea of an all-European home is no longer simply a political metaphor, but a forward-looking political program. We do not have the blueprint of this home. It is obvious. It is an all-European home and we have to build it together on the basis of total consensus for all the future inhabitants. It can already be confidently stated that the very existence of the idea of an all-European home is evidence of fundamental changes on the European Continent—political, economic, and cultural. The idea is a logical product of the Helsinki process, picked up and developed by Vienna.

This Gorbachev-Thatcher meeting is the fourth. All the previous ones have made a considerable contribution to the development of bilateral Soviet-British relations and to strengthening world peace.

Let us hope, and there is every reason to do so, that the fourth meeting, lasting 40 hours, will also be fruitful.

London Presummit Mood Reported

PM0604114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 89 Second Edition p5

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and A. Maslennikov: "Before the Summit Meeting"]

[Text] London, 5 Apr—M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Britain begins today, late evening local time, and, by the time most of our readers receive this newspaper, the leaders of the two countries will be holding talks in the British prime minister's residence at 10, Downing Street.

The Soviet-British summit meeting is the focus of British public attention. All of today's local newspapers carry headlines on this subject, commenting on the possible course of the meeting and voicing ideas on its results. THE GUARDIAN, for example, has devoted six pages to a detailed examination and analysis of Soviet-British relations.

It is being unanimously pointed out that the current talks between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher will take place in the more favorable international climate which is primarily the result of the Soviet side's peace initiatives and the internal changes taking place in our country.

THE TIMES has published the results of a recent public opinion poll which, according to the newspaper, reflect "dramatic changes" in the British attitude to the Soviet Union. Only 17 percent of the respondents believe that our country now "poses a threat to Britain." In 1981 this figure was 42 percent. The number of people who believe that "the USSR aspires to extend its power to other countries" has more than halved and the number of those who think that "the USSR sincerely wants peace" has risen from 6 percent in 1981 to 37 percent now. And an extremely symptomatic point is that 76 percent of the respondents said that "it will be better for Britain's security if the world is free of nuclear weapons by the end of the century." So the majority of British people have expressed an opinion on those conceptual differences which exist between Britain and the Soviet Union regarding nuclear weapons.

Editorials and commentaries have expressed frank recommendations for the prime minister—not to miss the opportunities opening up in connection with M.S. Gorbachev's visit. "The time has come for real action rather than just words," THE DAILY MIRROR wrote. "This must primarily take the form of progress in arms reduction, improvements in Soviet-British relations, and the establishment of lasting peace on earth."

This tone predominates as a whole in the British press today, which emphasizes the exceptional importance of the Soviet-British summit meeting both for bilateral relations and for the whole of Europe. One of the most influential observers here, P. Jenkins, for example, published an article in THE INDEPENDENT in which he says that M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the United Nations "overturned history" and voices the hope that the Soviet leader's Guildhall speech will make it possible to perceive the outlines of our "common European home."

At the same time, the local press also reflects the line set by the Foreign Office shortly before the start of the summit meeting. We are referring to the speech by Foreign Minister Howe in the "Panorama" television program, in which he essentially repeated old views by speaking of the military "superiority of the Soviet Union in Europe." "I have pointed out several times," Howe said, "that when you are as well armed as they are and your hat is full of well armed rabbits, you can pull them out over a long period of time. We in the West must stay committed to our defense and to the agenda we have set ourselves." Howe also repeated the jarring phrase about the "Russian bear." These "rabbits" and this "bear" have been set loose in the pages of the British press, surprising many readers by their appearance.

This kind of "prelude" to the summit meeting has aroused strong criticism here. Many British MP's from the Labor Party have protested in this connection. Both on television and in the newspapers, Howe's attitude has failed to find support in many instances. Obviously, all this could not be ignored, and now, on the eve of the visit, the British foreign secretary is drawing up the priorities of his policy differently. "During the forthcoming Soviet-British talks," he has just said, "the Thatcher government will strongly urge the USSR to offer detailed proposals regarding the reduction of conventional arms in Europe." Well, one can only welcome this approach. After all, the Soviet Union has a wide-ranging, specific program on this vital issue.

A number of local newspapers are actively hyping the subject of human rights in the Soviet Union, debating how it is going to be discussed at the summit meeting. Many are having to admit that the Soviet side also has something to say on this matter. About the "Guildford Four" and "Birmingham Six," in particular. Their fate, observers believe, could be raised during the talks.

So, work will begin tomorrow morning. The most vital problems are on the agenda of the talks: Disarmament, regional conflicts (Afghanistan, southern Africa, the Near East, and Central America), humanitarian issues,

European problems, economic cooperation, and the development of trade. Thirty six hours are set aside for all this, and people here are hoping that not one minute will be wasted.

Thatcher's Visit to Africa Viewed

PM3103104789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent A. Krivopalov dispatch: "British Premier's African Tour"]

[Text] London—The head of the British cabinet is continuing her official tour of African countries. Morocco was the first stop on this transcontinental route stretching for many miles.

On arriving in the Arab country governed by King Hassan II, who shows a special interest in the peaceful settlement of the protracted conflict in the Near East, Mrs Thatcher devoted special attention to just this problem. "Thatcher urged Israel to enter into negotiations with the PLO"—this was the London INDEPENDENT's headline for its report on the British prime minister's stay in Morocco. The cabinet head proposed, in particular, that the Tel Aviv authorities agree to talks with "representatives of the Palestinian people both from the occupied territories themselves and from outside."

In this connection I recall a recent trip by W. Waldegrave, British minister of state for foreign affairs, who visited the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. The high-ranking diplomat, who before that had met with Y. 'Arafat in Algiers—which fact, incidentally, had aroused a storm of indignation in Israeli Government circles—spoke very harshly at the time about the regime of suppressing the Palestinians' uprising. Now the head of the UK cabinet has also spoken of the futility of terror in the captured lands.

The theme of settling regional conflicts is one of the main ones to which M. Thatcher gives preference. On the eve of her trip she granted an interview to the Zimbabwean newspaper THE HERALD, declaring that Britain pursues a positive policy with regard to the "front-line" states and the Republic of South Africa [RSA].

No one must have any doubts, she emphasized, that Britain condemns apartheid. "I advocate the release of Nelson Mandela and the holding of talks between representatives of the white and black population of the RSA on condition that violence ends." There is no doubt that the prime minister wants to ease the dissatisfaction of those people in Africa who criticize the Conservative government's attitude to the question of economic sanctions directed against the apartheid regime. No, she has not changed her position but wants to take advantage of the changes—meaning the accords on a settlement of the situation in South-West Africa—in order to eliminate the critical dead-end confrontation between the RSA and the neighboring African states. Talking in Lagos with Nigerian President Babangida, Margaret Thatcher mentioned, in particular, the upcoming visits to London by a whole number of South African ministers.

Persuasion or pressure? The British capital evidently has not abandoned the first but may, perhaps, want also to make greater use than before of the second method. Official London has great opportunities to pursue a constructive policy in one of the most dangerously explosive regions of the world.

French Defense Minister's USSR Visit Reported

Chevenement Shown Backfire Bomber

AU0704094089 Paris AFP in English 0903 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 7 (AFP)—The Sukhoy-24 bomber, of which the Soviet Union has just acknowledged delivering six to Libya, was unveiled to the West for the first time this week during a visit by French Defence Minister Jean Pierre Chevenement.

Mr. Chevenement, together with French defence officials and journalists, were shown the bomber at Kubinka Base, west of Moscow on Tuesday.

The twin-engined swing-wing plane has a destructive power equivalent to the U.S. Fb-111, which the Americans used to bomb Tripoli.

The Su-24 shown at Kubinka was equipped with around 20 bombs of 250 kilos (550 pounds) stowed at various points under the wings and fuselage.

Known as the Backfire in NATO terminology, it is capable of carrying up to eight tons of armaments, a Soviet officer said. Despite its weight, it is able to use earth landing strips and has a range of 480 kilometres (300 miles), which can almost be doubled with the addition of extra fuel tanks, but which cut its arms load capacity.

One version of the bomber can be refuelled in flight.

The Su-24 flies at twice the speed of sound and is capable of carrying nuclear arms.

It carries a two-man crew, a pilot and weapons system operator. It is equipped with powerful radar, including a terrain-following radar enabling it to approach its targets at low altitude, the French Defence Ministry officials were told.

Since it was brought into service in 1984, the Soviet Air Force has 160 Su-24s and the Soviet Navy another 140, according to the U.S. Defense Department. Washington estimates they are being manufactured at a rate of 30 a year. [passage omitted]

Military Officials at Chevenement Talks

PM0704091189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Talks ended 5 April between Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and French Defense Minister J.P. Chevenement, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit. Taking part in the talks were, on the Soviet side, Army General M.S. Moiseyev, USSR Armed Forces chief of General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General V.I. Varennikov and Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, and Army General V.M. Shabanov, deputy defense ministers; and on the French side, French Ambassador to the USSR Y. Pagniez, and also the officials accompanying the defense minister.

On the same day there was a conversation between J.P. Chevenement and USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov.

The French defense minister visited the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy named for K.Ye. Voroshilov.

The French visitor was also shown around the Kremlin.

Chevenement Interviewed

LD0604215889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Report on interview with French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement by Irina Mishina in Moscow on 5 April—recorded; Chevenement remarks in French followed by Russian report of remarks]

[Text] [Mishina] This is the first visit of a French defense minister to the Soviet Union in the last 12 years. How did the present visit become possible? What was on Jean-Pierre Chevenement's mind when he left for our country?

[Chevenement] This visit is a logical continuation of the process of rapprochement between our two countries, which was begun at summit level in October 1985, says Jean-Pierre Chevenement. My coming to the Soviet Union means something more than an intention to restore bilateral contacts in the military sphere, the French minister continues. This is also a result of the rapprochement in the approaches of the USSR and France to a whole series of important issues of international security. I mean, in particular, the universal and complete ban of chemical weapons, and the striving not to allow nuclear weapons to be sited in space. In France, the USSR's decision on the withdrawal of the limited contingent of its forces from Afghanistan is highly evaluated. Our positions coincide on a whole series of regional problems as well. For example, they coincide on the prospects for a settlement of the Middle East conflict, on the situation in the south of Africa, and in Central America. All of this creates the prerequisites for a fruitful dialogue with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

[Mishina] Since European security was discussed, I was curious about how France was intending to assist the success of the talks on the reduction of conventional weapons in Vienna.

[Chevenement] France introduced to these talks a whole set of proposals, including one on the inadmissability of military attack and the unleashing of prolonged conflict. We also consider that the Vienna talks should be conducted on a well-defined and formulated basis, between sovereign states not military blocs. I should note, continues Jean-Pierre Chevenement, that we in France perceive with great satisfaction the practical measures of the Soviet Union on the unilateral reduction of its armed forces. My meeting today with the head of the Soviet Government has again convinced me of the precision and consistency of the Soviet position on this issue, the French minister emphasized.

[Mishina] During the talks unanimity of views was not reached on all issues. This concerns in particular, the modernization of nuclear weapons, which are present in several West European countries, including France. In the words of the French minister, the modernization of nuclear weapons is nothing more than France striving to guarantee its own security.

In concluing the conversation, I asked Jean-Peirre Chevenement to appraise the prospects for Soviet- French relations.

[Chevenement] Our countries are drawn together by many things in history. We were allies during World War II. The role of the Soviet army in liberating Europe from facism is rated highly in France. A traditional relationship of friendship exists between our countries, but in my view we also have a large unused potential for bilateral exchanges in the most varied spheres. With regard to this, we place great hopes on further contacts between the leaders of the USSR and France. As a whole, in my view our relations have lately been developing in the right direction.

[Mishina] This is how Jean-Piere Chevenement, the French defense minister finished his interview with all-union radio.

Chevenement Visits Severomorsk Base

LD0604152489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1424 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Murmansk, 6 Apr (TASS)—Correspondent Vasiliy Belousov reports:

Severomorsk, which in the West is regarded as one of the USSR's most secret navy bases, ceased to be so from today. A representative foreign delegation visited here for the first time in this town's history. The curtain of secrecy was lifted by French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

"What is the meaning of your decision to acquaint the French with this secret base?" This question was addressed by French journalists accompanying Jean-Pierre Chevenement to Vladimir Chernavin, USSR deputy defense minister, commander-in-chief of the USSR Navy and admiral of the fleet, during the inspection of the latest guided missile cruiser "Marshal Ustinov."

"I would not isolate this issue from the political aspect of the matter," the Soviet military commander answered. "Had it not been for political progress, this show would hardly have taken place. You and I are in the capital of the Northern Fleet, where no foreigners have been in the entire postwar period. As a military man, I am pleased with the political progress that is taking place in relations between our countries. And I am experiencing great satisfaction from the fact that we can go further along the path of trust, to take the next steps and show you what we haven't shown anyone yet."

It is not difficult to imagine with what interest French specialists and journalists examined the Soviet Navy vessels.

The other Navy vessels at the moorings of the base and on drydock, naturally, were not ignored either. The French literally availed themselves to the hilt of the opportunity to photograph everything. They did not spare film either in photographing other places in Zapolyarye, where they managed to stay during the brief visit. And, it seems to me, they could not but appreciate this openness.

FRG Parties Urge Disarmament Steps

LD0304081689 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Bonn April 3 TASS—Karsten Voigt, leading expert on foreign policy matters of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] group in the Bundestag, has urged the leadership of the North Atlantic Alliance to expedite the process of normalising the political climate between West and East by putting forward its own initiatives in the field of disarmament.

At the time NATO was founded, its principal objective was formulated as deterrence and defence against a supposed Soviet attack, Voigt said in a televised debate marking the 40th anniversary of NATO.

The Soviet Union has no intentions to attack the West. On the contrary, it to a considerable extent, reduces its offensive potential. Therefore in present conditions the North Atlantic Alliance should undertake to accomplish new tasks—in every way to promote the process of disarmament and the development of international cooperation.

Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU-CSU [Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union] group in the Bundestag, appearing in the same televised debate, called for achieving concrete results at the Vienna talks on conventional arms in Europe.

'Scandal' in FRG Over Pakistan Nuclear Deals

PM0304110589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Ye. Grishin under the rubric "Events: Substance and Opinions": "Nuclear Technology for Pakistan; Scale of Illegal Deals Between West German Concerns and Islamabad"]

[Text] Bonn—West German firms and scientific centers are actively contributing to the buildup of Pakistan's nuclear potential by acting in circumvention of FRG laws.

The first reports on secret nuclear business channels with Islamabad appeared in the local press at the end of last year. The weekly WELT AM SONNTAG published, in particular, an expose on how two Hessen firms, Neue Technologien and Physikalische-Technische Beratung, have illegally supplied Pakistan with nuclear equipment and technology and raw materials suitable for the production of nuclear weapons. Verifying the alerts from the press, the Hanau public prosecutor found in the companies' safes documents and other evidence confirming that equipment had been sold to Pakistan for the processing of uranium raw material and fissionable materials to the sum of DM20 million. When questioned, three members of Neue Technologien, including Rudolf Ortmayer, former head of the firm, admitted their guilt. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against them and six other entrepreneurs.

But, it has now become clear, the shady dealings brought to light were only the "tip of the iceberg of a major nuclear affair" between Bonn and Islamabad. The most recent issue of STERN magazine carried material claiming that more than 70 West German firms and scientific establishments are involved in illegal deals with Pakistan. They include such pillars of FRG industry as the chemical concerns Degussa and Hannover Vakuumschmelze, the electrical equipment giants Siemens and Bosch, the machine-building and trade companies Leibold-Hereus and Karl Kolb [names as published], and the Nuclear Research Society in Karlsruhe, which comes under the control of the Bonn government. "The list of suspected firms fills 19 pages," STERN wrote.

On the Pakistani side, the following are involved in the shady deals: The Technical Equipment Administration, Pakistan Chemical Company, and others. The secret deliveries of nuclear equipment were made through bogus firms and organizations in Liechtenstein, France, Kuwait, and Switzerland.

Using the example of the illegal sale to Pakistan of high-vacuum equipment worth DM3.5 million, the magazine demonstrates how this was arranged in practice. The equipment, in dismantled form, was sent to a French firm in the small town of Valence, and, over the course of 3 months, this firm sent it via Paris, in several consignments, to the city of Dubai (United Arab Emirates). From there, the equipment was transferred to Pakistan.

Over 15 years of nuclear business, STERN wrote, Islamabad has received the very latest electronic and electrical engineering equipment from Bonn, as well as specialized measuring equipment, compressors and uranium enriching equipment, vacuum furnaces, optical instruments, and large quantities of tritium, beryllium, and zirconium—in short, everything needed to make a nuclear bomb. We should point out that Pakistan has still not signed the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

To all appearances, FRG ruling circles knew about the secret deals but chose to turn a blind eye to them. Only after persistent protests from its allies, including the United States and Britain, has Bonn begun to stir. On the initiative of opposition parties—the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) and the Greens Party—a special Bundestag commission has been set up and has begun to investigate the "nuclear affair." A member of the commission, Bernd Reuter (SPD), has said that even the first steps in the investigation of the secret deals have confirmed many of the facts reported by the press.

Another political scandal is brewing in Bonn. The government and the chancellor's associates mainly fear a negative reaction from the international community. There are growing suspicions that the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons has probably been directly violated by West German firms.

In short, there could be a lot of unpleasantness. For the ruling parties, this carries the threat of another loss of votes at the forthcoming June elections to the European Parliament. It is precisely for this reason that we should expect official Bonn to try to prolong the investigation as much as possible and remove the main protagonists in the affair from the firing line.

KGB Chief Kryuchkov Meets Turkish Ambassador

LD0604125489 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB State Security Committee, received the Turkish ambassador to the Soviet Union, Volkan Vural, at the latter's request today.

They had a substantive discussion on a number of foreign policy issues.

Political & Social

Central Committee Member Criticizes Yeltsin

PM0604155189 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 89 p 3

["Letter to the Editorial Office" from V. Tikhomirov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, lathe and borer operator at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich Plant: "I Deem It My Party Duty"]

[Text] On reading the information report on the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum, millions of people noticed the proposal by a group of Communists, mainly representatives of the working class and the peasantry, to discuss and appraise certain statements by B.N. Yeltsin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, which, as the report said, run contrary to the Central Committee's political directives and to the CPSU's party ethics and statute norms.

My name appears at the top of this list, and I therefore deem it my party and civic duty to explain, without beating about the bush, why I and a number of comrades submitted this proposal.

First of all, briefly about myself: I am 55 years old and have spent all my working life (with a break for Army service) at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich Electrical Engineering Plant. I started as a lathe operator there in 1952, and I still work there. My father has been a Communist since February 1917, I joined the party in 1958, and have been elected a member of its Central Committee.

Why do I give this information? Obviously, there are many who would like to find out what sort of people are B.N. Yeltsin's political opponents. Like those who raised the question of his stance at the Central Committee plenum, I am one of his political opponents. There is no need to tone things down—it is an unavoidable fact.

Yeltsin's name, in contrast with us ordinary working people, is now known to many. And my step at the Central Committee plenum is by no means an attempt to compete with him in popularity. Especially since, in my view, that popularity is dubious.

The last straw in determining this step of mine consisted of two things: A personal meeting with Boris Nikolayevich in early March, and a recent demonstration by the so-called Democratic Union on Mayakovskiy Square on the anniversary of the February Revolution.

What is the connection between these two events? Let me try to explain. Some 2 weeks ago, construction engineer V.I. Tkach, who had come to Moscow from the Ukraine, sought me out in my capacity as a member of the party Central Committee. He had spent days on end unsuccessfully doing the rounds of offices at the USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs [Gosstroy] in an attempt to resolve the question of how best to introduce in his institute a directive elaborated by the Gosstroy on enhancing the quality of technical documentation. Functionaries heard him out and sent him on to a different specialist. This situation is, unfortunately, familiar to many.

That was when Viktor Ivanovich decided to seek the truth from B.N. Yeltsin, who is in charge of these matters at the USSR Gosstroy. The visitor, as he later told me, was prompted to take this step by Yeltsin's countless calls for merciless eradication of the bureaucracy apparatus. Imagine the man's disappointment when, on entering the reception room of a member of the government and USSR minister, he encountered—instead of a businesslike working atmosphere—a group of people engaged in their own personal telephone conversations. Their interest in the caller on official business was finally extinguished when they found out that he was in Moscow strictly for business purposes and not to take part in the election campaign hustle.

He finally managed to get inside the minister's office. The occupant of the office spent 40 minutes giving him an outline of his election campaign which contained a fair amount of reflection about restructuring and the struggle against bureaucratism and, to make up for this, not a single word about the specific matter which his caller wanted to discuss.

To be honest, at first I disbelieved what Viktor Ivanovich told me. But he is a persistent man; he sought me out and told me: Is anyone likely to believe me that after 2 weeks at the Gosstroy I still have not managed to resolve this specific question? Help me out.

So I had to make my way to the Gosstroy. Unfortunately, V.I. Tkach is right—business is the last thing on people's minds in that rarefied reception room. They are campaigning for the minister's mandate as deputy. Telephones never stop ringing, instructions are issued as to who should go where to meet whom. My presence simply went unnoticed. Nevertheless, I firmly demanded a meeting with B.N. Yeltsin. And, following long negotiations with his technical secretary and his aide, I was received.

The minister picked up the telephone and called the appropriate subdivision, asking for the problem to be sorted out on the spot. It proved that the question, over which a visitor to Moscow had spent 2 weeks running around the department, could have been resolved within literally 1 minute.

But I was not pleased with this "victory." What has happened to restructuring, what has happened to the innovative work style which B.N. Yeltsin advocates in words, if this is the way the Gosstroy combats bureaucratism?

A few days later, on 12 March, leaflets containing vile attacks against the October revolution and Soviet power were distributed—as reported also by MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA—at a frankly provocative gathering in downtown Moscow, on Mayakovskiy Square, under the banner of the so-called Democratic Union. Leaflets calling on people to vote for Yeltsin were also distributed there. A strange and unimaginable combination.

Of course, B.N. Yeltsin might say that he was totally uninvolved in that.

But then one might ask: What is this—coincidence, irresponsibility, or a stance taken by the candidate deputy's action group?

The rallying of Yeltsin's supporters around his platform did not occur either yesterday or today. They were brought together by Boris Nikolayevich's numerous statements at meetings with voters.

Many Muscovites, and not just Muscovites, are seeing for themselves how a member of the CPSU Central Committee, who has spent more than 20 years in leading party work, and consequently shares responsibility for the blunders and mistakes in our life, is now trying to draw universal attention to them while keeping himself on the sidelines. And not just keeping himself on the sidelines, but taking the stance of an active and uninvolved critic and exposer.

I have been with him at Central Committee plenums. He has never voted against a single fundamental question of the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy. He spoke at Central Committee plenums only while he was first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee [gorkom]. His voice was never heard before, nor has it been heard since. But if you were to listen to him talking at election meetings, he always has his own opinion on any Central Committee decision.

Even on a fundamental question like the party's role in restructuring. He publicly admitted at the 19th all-union party conference that he perceives the CPSU as the political nucleus of a Soviet society which is renewing itself. Consequently, I simply could not believe my ears when I heard Yeltsin's words about the need for broad debate about a multiparty system, about the party's subordination to the soviets, about the creation of other youth organizations in counterbalance to the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League, about our society's not knowing where it is going. What is the truth? Whose program will he, as member of the CPSU Central Committee, uphold? Against whose platform—if not that of the CPSU?—does he urge the creation of an opposition comprising 20-30 percent of deputies to the Congress of Soviets?

B.N. Yeltsin's election campaign platform which emerges from his election campaign statements is totally different from the one he officially published. And this process engenders the myth—which is disseminated by some people—about Comrade Yeltsin's special principledness.

Alas, our mentality is such that people tend to believe what they want to believe, even though life may disprove their beliefs at literally every step. Very often it is simply difficult to understand which of Yeltsin's words tell the truth and which are fabrications. First he declares that he personally submitted his resignation from all party posts, then he tries to convince people that he has been pressured.

And never mind his public statements that he is allegedly threatened, telephoned, and visited by malevolents. I have already described how I struggled to make my way to the minister's office, and as for the block where Boris Nikolayevich lives, you cannot even walk past it in the street. As for my home, the telephone has been "spewing" abuse and threats against me ever since 16 March. But I have nothing to fear. I am at my post. I tend my machine.

During an election campaign meeting in the Hall of Columns, B.N. Yeltsin was asked a question about his daughter's apartment. He replied that she changed her accommodation because it was unsuitable. I obtained official information from the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee: When moving from Sverdlovsk to Moscow, Yeltsin's daughter obtained an apartment in a high-grade block at No 1/21 Dostoyevskiy Street. On 15 September 1987 the daughter of the Moscow party gorkom's first secretary, basing her application on her desire to live nearer to her parents, applied to be allocated another apartment. Consequently, she obtained an apartment with an area of almost 100 square meters, and large enough for four, in Block No 1 on A. Nevskiy Street. There were no certificates from the sanitary and epidemiology service or from a technical inspector about the apartment's unsuitability. Her old "unsuitable for occupation" apartment was, of course, immediately occupied by someone else. This is just one example of the personal practice of a fighter against all sort of privileges.

The same also applies to the special hospital and the "Chayka" automobile. Here is what I was told by the USSR Council of Ministers administrator of affairs: As a member of the government, Comrade B.N. Yeltsin has a two-story dacha in Uspenskoye settlement. The settlement also has a store selling quite a broad range of products. As regards the so-called rations about which he is still talking, they were abolished by a Politburo decision back in September last year. Of course, Boris Nikolayevich also has the use of a "Chayka." About the special hospital. A few days ago B.N. Yeltsin indeed registered at a polyclinic at his place of residence, but members of his family continue to use the service

provided by the Ministry of Health Fourth Main Administration, while Boris Nikolayevich himself requested a travel voucher to one of this main administration's sanatoriums beginning 27 March. So let us not get confused: Comrade Yeltsin is sufficiently active in using those selfsame "benefits" against which he is publicly "struggling." And it does look as if the moment to give them up was accurately chosen "for public consumption."

Here is how another myth about Boris Nikolayevich's "democratism" was born. On one occasion, while first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, he arrived at a plant by streetcar. But only a few of those who were moved by this fact knew that B.N. Yeltsin and those accompanying him had transferred from their cars into the streetcars just before the halt at the plant gates. How is this to be assessed?

As a human being, I was really pained and insulted by Boris Nikolayevich's stance when he renounced the post of first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom and candidate member of the Central Committee Politburo. After all, while holding these high offices he had close at hand every opportunity to ensure that our Moscow really became a city convenient for its millions of residents. I can only assume that a specific job is much harder than general deliberations about troubles in our common home.

And does not his stay—yes, stay, rather than work—at the Gosstroy testify to the same? A construction engineer by training and a major economic leader in the construction industry, he constantly declares that he is bored by "shuffling paper" in the Gosstroy. Was this the real reason why he was posted to this sector of practical work? The construction industry now is our tightest bottleneck. This is where we need knowledge, experience, energy, will, and the party approach demanded by restructuring of every Communist in order to fulfill the task set by the party and for which we voted at the 27th congress—to supply every Soviet person with a separate apartment or home by the year 2000.

That much more is demanded when it comes to a Communist in a leadership position and candidate member of the Soviet parliament. Or does Boris Nikolayevich intend to make nothing but declarations there, to criticize everyone and everything from the sidelines? I can neither accept nor share this position. Politics demands honesty from people above all. This is why I submitted the proposal at the party Central Committee plenum.

Of course, B.N. Yeltsin is much better educated than I, an ordinary machine operator. His experience in party work is immeasurably greater than mine. But does this not impose on Communist Yeltsin special responsibility for the unity of the party which unhesitatingly took on the heavy burden of remedying everything that obstructed us, of specific work to improve Soviet people's lives?

Today's main task is not simply to talk about restructuring, democracy, and glasnost, but for everyone to participate in these processes, to aim for tangible results. I am convinced that the deputies from the CPSU elected at the March plenum will justify the party's trust and will work with the people and for the people. But I would also like to say that workers and the peasantry are primarily the losers in the current election campaign. This worries us. We are also worried by the fact that individual demagogues are surfacing on the wave of democratization and glasnost, defaming the party and the Soviet power by all possible means and feeling more and more at ease as the amount of filth in their statements increases. In my view, it is impossible to overlook these phenomena, let alone play up to them.

I am a worker at the Vladimir Ilich Plant, whose workers were addressed by V.I. Lenin on six occasions in the terrible year of 1918. There was a criminal attempt on V.I. Lenin's life, and therefore on the entire party's life, following one of his meetings with the workers. Today we Communists will not allow any attempts on the party's life.

[Signed] V. Tikhomirov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, lathe and borer operator at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich Plant

Yeltsin Rebuts 'Falsification'

PM3103104989 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 89 p 3

[Letter from B.N. Yeltsin, candidate USSR people's deputy from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic No 1 Moscow City National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, dated 22 March 1989: "To the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Editorial Office"]

[Text] **On 19 March MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA published a letter from V.P. Tikhomirov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, under the headline "I Deem It My Party Duty." In response to this statement, the editorial office received a letter from B.N. Yeltsin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, which we also publish in full, without any editorial emendation.**

Of course, the editorial office reserves the right to make a statement on the substance of the issues raised in V.P. Tikhomirov's and B.N. Yeltsin's letters.

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA's issue dated 19 March 1989 carried a letter from V.P. Tikhomirov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, which contains a distorted evaluation of some provisions in my election platform and of my party and civic stance. In this context, I ask the editorial office to publish the following.

Comrade Tikhomirov's article is an expanded and partially reworked version of his speech at the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum. I have already replied to all points raised in that speech in the statement

I made at that selfsame plenum. Nonetheless, Comrade Tikhomirov in his article again returns to the same questions and, if his speech at the plenum could still be perceived as a sincere desire to clarify matters and share his fears, now—after his letter to MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA—it can only be a matter of deliberate falsification. After all, Comrade Tikhomirov, a member of the CPSU Central Committee, is not so politically naive as to be unable to understand the difference between the demand "to make the party subordinate to the soviets" and my program's provision about "legislative accountability of all government, political, and public organizations without exception, including the party, to the supreme organ of power."

Central Committee Member Comrade Tikhomirov cannot fail to understand the difference between "a call for the creation of a second party," as he put it at the plenum, or a call for "broad debate on a multiparty system," as he writes in his article, and my statements at a meeting with voters that this cannot be made a taboo topic for the mass media, since this debate has in fact already begun and since almost all Politburo members have already spoken out on this question.

Central Committee Member Comrade Tikhomirov cannot fail to understand the difference between a call to set up an opposition to the CPSU platform in the Congress of Soviets and my statements that 20-30 percent of deputies adopting an active civic stance, by uniting, if necessary, and involving the public at large, will be able to promote the passage of long overdue draft laws through the new Supreme Soviet.

Central Committee Member Comrade Tikhomirov cannot fail to understand what is behind him, what political provocations are, and what diverse forms they may take.

A sizable part of Comrade Tikhomirov's article—and this was not contained in his plenum statement—is devoted to detailed official information about my and my family's living conditions and about special benefits, which he makes out that I actively enjoy. Usually it is the "competent organs" that deal with data of this sort. The fact that a Central Committee member and a worker has gathered, processed, and published this kind of information is perhaps unprecedented in our party's history, even in the worst of times.

Deeming it unnecessary to offer explanations on every single point of this protocol, I would say that, having read the article, I have become even more convinced of how acute the question of social justice and unlawful nomenklatura benefits is in our society and of how hypocritical are the statements by some high-ranking leaders that nothing of the sort exists in our country and that this question is being artificially stirred up.

I was convinced once more that I was right to raise these questions in my election program, and I declare once more that I will continue to struggle for the establishment of social justice in society. I will struggle both by continuing, expanding, and carrying through to completion the practice of personally rejecting special benefits, and by aiming for a principled political solution to this problem.

Yes, society and the party are experiencing a crisis. But the way out of this crisis must be sought not by discrediting individual candidate USSR people's deputies.

The way out of the crisis lies via the radical democratization of the party and society, via a struggle against the party-bureaucratic apparatus, corruption, and social injustice. Only thus will we be able to achieve a new image of socialism and a new state of Soviet society.

There is one more point I would like to make in conclusion. The MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA item is not a single isolated episode. It is part of a campaign that has been waged by the apparatus of the Moscow City Party Committee and some rayon party committees ever since the start of the present election campaign, and that was stepped up in particular after my registration as candidate in the No 1 Moscow National-Territorial Electoral Okrug.

I must note with regret that the methods used by the apparatus in this campaign are far from democratic. They include pressure on the labor collectives which nominated me as their candidate, difficulties in organizing meetings with voters, cancellation of nomination protocols, work to hand pick participants in okrug meetings, and even the dissemination of anonymous "compromising material" within the walls in rayon party committees, and a special appeal by a rayon soviet session telling its residents for whom and against whom to vote.

The MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA item, just like its anonymous article "Unsuitable Platform" on 2 March 1989 [description, date of article as published] and the editorial office's refusal to publish a rebuttal signed by several hundred workers from the "Soyuz" Plant, is part and parcel of the selfsame policy which, as a matter of fact, is pursued as regards several other candidates. But this is a foolish policy, a policy obviously and blatantly contravening the party's election platform, a policy leading to confrontation between the party apparatus and the broad people's masses, a policy ultimately creating a rupture between the party and the people and leading to the loss of the party's prestige among the masses.

I am against this policy, against its promoters, whether deliberate or honestly confused, and against the organizers and inspirers of this policy.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, candidate USSR people's deputy from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic No 1 Moscow City National-Territorial Electoral Okrug 22 March 1989.

Solovyev Interviewed on Leningrad Election Results
PM0604114389 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 p 1

[Interview in Leningrad with Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad Oblast party committee, by V. Koshvanets, chief of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA's party and soviet building department, under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Let's Be Realistic"—date not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The okrug electoral commissions' report published the day before yesterday on the results of the elections for USSR's people's deputies in Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast prompted numerous telephone calls to the editorial office. Readers have been asking us to comment on the election results.

V. Koshvanets, chief of the newspaper's party and soviet building department, met in the Smolnyy with Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad Oblast party committee [obkom], and asked him a few questions.

Question: Yuriy Filippovich, how do you personally assess the election results in our region?

Answer: This should clearly be called an interview with a loser. After all, I was one of the candidates who failed to obtain the necessary number of votes. Incidentally, we will probably return to this subject. But in answering your question, I would say that the election results, as the entire election campaign which preceded them, should undoubtedly be considered an asset for restructuring.

Discussions are still continuing on whether restructuring could be reversed and what factors should become reality to ensure that it becomes irreversible. There are many of these factors, but in my view the decisive factor is the creation and emergence of conditions for the people to freely express their will and govern themselves.

The party, the 19th all-union party conference decisions, and the Law on Elections have created precisely these conditions. This means that during the elections—and the okrug electoral commissions' report published in the newspaper provides graphic confirmation of this—a fundamentally important step was taken along the road of restructuring and making restructuring irreversible.

Question: A number of leading party and soviet workers in Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast—including the first secretary of the CPSU obkom—were defeated in the elections. What can you say in this connection?

Answer: Let me talk first about myself. There's little to be happy about, of course, and I think that everyone will understand me from a human point of view. Well, I will draw conclusions and analyze what happened, including the results of more than 50 meetings that I had during the election period with the voters of Nevskiy Okrug.

Incidentally, during these meetings voters put forward many concrete suggestions linked with the resolution of certain acute social, economic, and other problems in the life of Leningrad and, of course, Nevskiy Rayon. All these suggestions have been taken on board and, although I have not become a people's deputy, I will strive as party obkom first secretary to rapidly resolve the problems raised.

Now to turn to the city and oblast leaders who ran as a whole. A detailed and thoughtful analysis of the election results—along with the entire course of the election campaign, its lessons, and mistakes, incidentally—still lies ahead.

But now, just after these events, I would say the following. We should not pretend that nothing happened, but nor should we overdramatize what happened. Let's be realistic. These elections were held in a special psychological and emotional atmosphere generated by social dissatisfaction among a considerable proportion of the population.

All of us, resolutely rejecting the past, want to live well and fairly—not in some distant future, but now, today, immediately. Yet the present has not yet given us that kind of life. On the contrary, in some ways life has even gotten harder at the day-to-day level. There are the shortages of a number of goods and foodstuffs, the sugar coupons, the disruptions to soap supplies, high cooperative prices, and much else besides.

In this situation all leaders became a kind of triple target. First, whether personally to blame for stagnation or not, they were weighed down with the burden of the past. Second, there is the burden of the present. Third, possessing full information on the situation in the country and the region, existing resources, and possibilities, and being realists, they could not allow themselves the luxury of promising voters—as did certain candidates—a land of milk and honey.

Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not making excuses for myself or for others. Leaders are answerable for everything—this formula operated in this specific case on election day, too, and it will continue to operate in the future.

Question: Some readers, and veterans in particular, express fears that the outcome of the elections will affect the prestige of the Leningrad party organization and even of the party as a whole....

Answer: Well, these are totally groundless fears. First, Solovyev or anyone else is far from being the party as a whole, or even the Leningrad party organization. Second, the election campaign and the elections themselves proved more convincingly than ever before that the working people and the population perceive none other than the party and the Communists as the real force of restructuring.

Let us recall—and these data were cited in the press—that never before, at no previous election, have there been so many party members among candidate deputies.

Having recalled this, let us turn again to the okrug commissions' report published by the newspaper. Elections in nine electoral okrugs were completed here 26 March. All nine USSR people's deputies who were elected are Communists. Furthermore, they all are members of elected party leadership organs performing responsible party tasks.

Nor can there be any doubt that the elected people's deputies will worthily represent Leningrad and the oblast in the country's supreme organ of state power.

Therefore, I repeat, there should be no fears about the party's prestige. On the contrary, the fact that the party embarked on these elections and deliberately made itself the target of criticism during the election contest has only boosted its prestige. The outcome of the elections primarily testifies that many people are dissatisfied with the progress of restructuring in Leningrad. So the pace must be accelerated and there must be changes for the better.

Regarding specific conclusions on the voting results, they will be drawn by the party obkom.

Question: And one last question, Yuriy Filippovich, which we have already partially discussed. What is to be done now, after the elections; what lessons are to be learned from them?

Answer: We have to think and to work. I have already said that the course of the election campaign, each one of its stages, and the election results themselves require a most serious and thorough analysis as a most important event in the democratization of the country's life and the assertion of genuine people's power.

It is hard to overrate the importance of such an analysis for the party organizations implementing a transition to political methods of leadership. It is already obvious that, when organizing the election campaign, we somehow failed to take society's psychological condition fully into account, somehow failed to properly study public opinion, somehow failed—let us be blunt here—to rise to the task as propaganda and agitation workers, and specifically failed to demonstrate tangibly and intelligibly to the voters the real changes which have already occurred in Leningrad and the oblast in the course of restructuring.

In short, it is necessary to improve the activity of party organizations along all avenues, and mainly to aim for real changes which Leningraders will be aware of in their work, at their dining tables, in transportation, and in consumer goods stores.

In other words, restructuring must be driven even more decisively forward.

And finally, we must successfully conclude the ongoing election campaign and elect active champions of restructuring as USSR people's deputies in the 12 okrugs where repeat or runoff elections are due to be held.

Leningrad Party Committees Review Elections

18000776 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS Report: "The Lessons of the Elections—the Lessons of Truth"]

[Text] Leningrad 4 April TASS—The joint plenum of the Leningrad CPSU obkom [oblast party committee] and gorkom [city party committee] being held today is dedicated to in-depth, self-critical, analysis of the summations of the work of the party organizations for ensuring the elections of USSR people's deputies within conditions of restructuring.

For the first time in many years, the procedures for speakers was not established in advance, and anyone desiring to express his opinion on the extraordinary events of 26 March, election day, could have the floor. A number of leading party and soviet leaders, including the CPSU obkom and gorkom first secretaries, did not gather the necessary number of electors' votes, and remained unelected. Plenum participants held a pointed discussion of principle, coordinating the voting results with the new social and political situation which has come about both in the country as a whole and in the Leningrad region.

It was noted that all spheres of public life have come into motion; radical changes are taking place in the party and soviet apparatus; political and economic reform are being realized. In addition, it was said that the Leningraders were dissatisfied with the pace of the resolution of the housing problem, the appearance of the city and the ecological environment; they are expressing their dissatisfaction with the deficit of manufactured goods and foodstuffs, and are concerned about crime. These painful problems were often moved to the center of the pre-electoral discussions, and exerted influence on the formation of public opinion surrounding the candidates.

The work of the party organizations, the ideological personnel, and the mass information media was uncompromisingly assessed at the plenum; during the course of the preparations for the elections, they had not always been up to the level required by restructuring.

In the current situation, many party activists showed a lack of ability to lead a pointed political discussion; it was underscored in the speeches that relapses into the command-administrative style of party work had had their effect.

The plenum characterized the results of the elections as a serious political lesson. It resolutely demanded that communists shelve their previous approaches and old methods of activity, constantly concerning themselves with the preservation and fortification of the party's vanguard role in society. The necessity of developing measures for the realization of critical comments and suggestions uttered by the voters during the course of the preparations for and the elections themselves was stressed.

Candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Leningrad obkom first secretary Yu. F. Solovyev spoke at the plenum.

Election Lessons, 'Ascent Toward Democracy' Viewed
PM0604122589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Apr 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by V. Lyubitskiy and A. Chernyak: "Ascent Toward Democracy on Rungs of Election Campaign"]

[Text] Neither the contenders for the deputies' seats themselves nor their ardent champions had time to draw breath before the day of 26 March—toward which we had been advancing for 4 months through hopes and doubts, through debates and arguments—was behind us. There will still be time for an in-depth, comprehensive analysis. But there is already a natural desire to look back over the path we have traveled and to consider to some degree at least some episodes of the first truly democratic election struggle we can remember, and to make at least cursory commemorative notches.

The first conclusion is that people have emerged from their state of apathy and have joined in political life. They had an interest in the elections and took a conscious part in shaping the supreme organ of power. There was a real election struggle. Taking part were thousands of candidate deputies and millions of voters. And that the word "struggle" is not now spoken in vain is borne out by the fact that 12 percent—that is over 250 deputies' seats—still remain vacant (until repeat elections or the runoff).

Another new feature, which was bitter for some and even stunning for others, was the nonelection of several dozen party committee first secretaries as USSR people's deputies. A truly unprecedented incident, especially if you consider that many of them were running in proud solitude in their own okrugs. Of course, it is not worth making a tragedy out of this. But we must think about the fact. And if we think, then, we must say that the people, aroused by restructuring, having tasted democracy and glasnost and approving restructuring as a whole, do not want to tolerate the fact that restructuring processes in society and in some party committees in particular are still proceeding only slowly, and are failing to produce the expected results. In voting against, people were saying "no" to bureaucratic methods of leadership, to the unsuitable style of a number of party workers.

As a whole, the party received at the elections the people's powerful and indisputable support—support that was all the more convincing in that the elections took place at a difficult, crucial time for the country. We must also consider the fact that this time no one dictated from above whom to elect and whom not to elect; the campaign was not "measured out" in speeches by prepared speakers but splashed out in polemics at meetings, and each of us gave birth to our position all along the long path to the voting.

This conclusion is by no means for use on posters. Today some people probably feel uncomfortable without the usual draping of "unanimity" and some people are dismayed in the face of the new realities of life. But voting, again for the first time, showed clearly the choice society is making, what it will not accept, and whom it wants to travel with and toward which goals.

And so let's look at the 4-month path we have traveled.

Nomination

First it looks as though the profound inertia of rest made itself felt. The delay in publishing the report on the scheduling of the elections went almost unnoticed and the electoral commissions were formed according to the usual canons....

It was only later, when election passions began in some places to break out of the framework of ethics and even of the law, when the new and far from formal influence of the commissions on the progress and outcome of the struggle was graphically manifested—it was only then that the labor collective councils and social activists suddenly realized that they had underestimated the importance of the first stage of electoral work.

Actually, its organizers in the local soviet and party organs also long remained captive to stereotypes. Commissions were often formed from those people who, as they say, "had experience"—many of the subsequent mistakes and conflicts began here. Agitation work sometimes did not begin until the candidates' actual registration, and as a result voters had to "feel their way" as they mastered the details of the new, democratic mechanisms of the elections. The party committees were not even in a hurry to explain the party's election platform, and later

it was easy to see individual candidates not so much associating themselves with the platform's more principled positions as making them out to be their own, being unstinting in easy promises....

But soon people felt that their right to self-expression had become reality.

For the first time in the organization of the elections the activeness of the soviet and party organs was combined with the voters' self-organization. They began to unite in action groups to take part in the electoral process. And the majority of nominated candidates were determined by the collectives at meetings, and not in "offices."

But here is what artist P. Kovalenko from Verkhnyaya Salda, Sverdlovsk Oblast, wrote to PRAVDA:

"I ask you take my word for it that the ordinary people with whom I associate say that everything about the elections has stayed the same. I try to explain to them the difference between the previous elections and the present elections, and they listen to me, but ask the kind of questions which I cannot answer. There was insufficient preparation for the election campaign, and we were not able to inform everyone of the meaning of the new law and the new provisions of the USSR Constitution. And I can confidently say that the main mass of people are still 'sleeping.' I think that the covert opponents of restructuring took advantage of this 'lethargy' by nominating candidates in their own group interests. I personally," the author concludes, "shall in principle not vote for a candidate I do not know."

Doctor of art history and RSFSR State Prize winner V. Bryusova from Moscow was left perplexed: As an active member of the sobriety movement, she was nominated as their candidate by her fellow thinkers from Novosibirsk, but her candidacy was not registered, the reason cited being that nomination could only be from her place of residence. "But there is no such condition in the law," Vera Grigoryevna writes.

To the last day, people put questions to the editorial office: "Why does one voter have 2-3 votes and another only one? And why are those elected at the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee already being called deputies—are we not going to vote for them 26 March? And why is the okrug electoral commission refusing to register the candidacy of someone who has nominated himself?"

Of course, the questions were dealt with and, as a rule, the misunderstandings were dispelled. Nonetheless the complacency, even the certain political sybaritism in which many party and soviet organs had existed at the initial stage of the electoral process, made themselves felt. For instance, it was by no means fortuitous that there were few workers, peasants, or women among the candidates....

In late February the party committee of the Moscow punched-card machine plant even adopted a special resolution:

"We are perplexed by the fact that the party organizations...have in fact relieved themselves of the formation of the cadre composition of the supreme organ of power.... They have not performed purposeful work to nominate workers. The plant party committee is not calling for the old quota methods—it is a case of the party's organizational and agitation work within the framework of democracy and legality."

The phenomenon has been accurately noted. Alas, later, in the desire to make up for what has been omitted, far from all party committees succeeded in refraining from tested methods of exerting pressure through edicts.

Registration

As a whole, the okrug electoral meetings gave a good account of themselves. But the press directed many critical arrows at them, and not for nothing. In a number of places they became a kind of filter for candidates who were inconvenient to the local authorities or who had not been planned for in advance.

In Kiyevskiy City National-Territorial Okrug No 33 the meeting took place under "strict regime" conditions. Despite appealing twice to N. Nikolenko (first as chief of the city party committee [gorkom] state and law department chief and then as deputy chairman of the okrug commission), A. Sokol, correspondent of the republican newspaper PRAVDA UKRAINY, did not manage to get into the hall to talk to the delegates. Indeed, the candidates themselves were "screened" through four checkpoints: at the entrance, after the entrance, at the staircase, and at the auditorium doors.

We should ask today: Why were such stringent measures introduced? We can understand that the outcome of the okrug meeting predetermines a great deal, and it is no accident that the law regulates the composition of the participants. But would it not be better to explain to people in advance the purpose and procedure of okrug meetings? And who knows whether the offensive artificial impediments were not reflected in the positions taken by the voters on election day, when they passed a vote of no confidence in Kiev Gorkom First Secretary K. Masik, who had spoken at the meeting?

And here is a different example. In Margelanskiy Territorial Okrug No 607 in Uzbekistan, everything seemed to look democratic. Five candidates spoke. They all had programs, although they smacked of wizardry ("promoting the continuous import of foodstuffs," "constructing leisure centers and hospitals on all farms.") During the voting some people even suggested holding a...dance contest among the contenders. And, rapidly

putting down their ballot slips, the meeting participants rushed to return to the hall. And as a result, just one candidacy was put forward for registration.

Here it is perhaps appropriate to recall the following point. With the restoration of the real possibility of "choosing at the elections," the concept of "political struggle" acquires a normal, rather than an artificially painted meaning. Naturally, in the expanding multiplicity of social trends, under the conditions of the pluralism of views of the ways and methods of restructuring, any candidate and his supporters seeks to prove that he is right, and they do this with greater or lesser ability and success. Yes, some people are let down by their restraint, and lack skill. Yes, sometimes it is not only clean hands which are reaching out for the fruit of democracy. But the more of these fruit there are, the more open they are for people to see, then the more reliably the future harvest is protected. Not declarations but arguments—that is what ensures authority under the conditions of glasnost. He who has these arguments has no need to decline polemics.

In this connection we should recall a PRAVDA item entitled "Storm in the 'Sea of Democracy'" (8 March). It discussed how the electoral commission in Murmanskiy Territorial Okrug No 224 had tried "not to notice" the dozens of radiograms in which the crews of the ships fishing in the ocean expressed their desire to nominate as their candidate deputy maritime college lecturer I. Rogacheva. The Murmansk party gorkom bureau, having discussed the article, deemed it "tendentious." But the facts speak rather of the electoral commission's bias.

The main point it uses to explain its actions is that the crew of the vessel is not a labor collective but only a subdivision, and therefore cannot nominate candidates. But while he was at the editorial office, Commission Chairman I. Chernyshenko wrote with his own hand a proposal to recognize the electoral powers of crews working far from their native shores and to establish a more flexible schedule of election procedures for them. What prevented him, given a certain interest, from requesting the consent of the Central Electoral Commission in good time? After all, the USSR State Flag is hoisted on every ship, some leaders are on the staff list as captain-directors with all ensuing consequences, and the crews represent our country in foreign ports. And you may even say that if the ships had been docked in their own country, would their opinion not have been heard at the okrug meeting? Why did they not want to listen to their voices on the radio? Yet in the role of "collective" they were represented by onshore management and auxiliary services.

There is no need to discuss the commission's other arguments—they are also redolent of formalism and indifference toward the fishermen's expression of their will. And it is not surprising that the elections reflected the responsive reaction: They failed to bring the necessary majority to a single one of the candidates registered for the okrug. At the same time the fishermen wrote the name of I. Rogacheva on many of the ballot slips. For the sake of what did the okrug commission members, and with them the party committee workers, "lose face?" Especially since, as Gorkom First Secretary B. Kharchenko admitted, there were no complaints about the Communist and scientist I. Rogacheva....

Meetings with the Voters

If the preceding stage may perhaps be considered the noisiest in the election campaign, then this was probably the most heated. The public comparison of candidate deputies' programs, the contest of intellects, single combat between agents—all this, if it took place within the framework of democratic norms, was turned into attractive mass lessons in state thinking and in civic boldness and initiative.

There's no point in concealing the fact that it was hardest of all for party workers at meetings with voters. After all, when people began to speak openly about sore subjects, then reproaches for the many social shortcomings were directed primarily against the party workers. And it is a good thing when they have something to say in reply—as was the case, for instance, with the first secretaries of Belgorod and Orel party oblast party committees [obkoms]. There are also many difficulties and problems in these oblasts, but their inhabitants can see the tangible flow of changes—in food supplies, and in the resurrection of the countryside. And both secretaries received a convincing vote of confidence at the elections.

One more feature of the election campaign was the agitation boom. Some candidates spared neither words nor funds to advertise themselves. Incidentally, many readers reasonably note that since we are talking about equal opportunities, it would be no bad thing to determine through legislation the procedure for financing the election campaign. After all, a candidate's professional and so to speak official "registration" had too obvious an influence on the forms and methods of his election agitation. Numerous printed posters and buses with loudspeakers described one candidate all over the city, while the supporters of another strewed the walls of apartment blocks with xeroxed copies of his programs, and the employees of institutions under the jurisdiction of another candidate, and even students, relieved, we are to suppose, of their workaday concerns, "joined in" the agitation for him. But somehow we did not manage to hear about action groups for any leading worker (most likely the initiators of his nomination are more concerned with the thrust of the matter), nor did we see colored portraits of a milkmaid, engineer, or doctor (where would they find generous "sponsors?"). So while democracy does not require homogeneity, it must guarantee equal opportunities.

In order to avoid, in particular, what happened in Orsk city, Orenburg Oblast, where 3 days before the election machine-building plant director R. Urusov announced

the withdrawal of his candidacy. [sentence published without main clause] He gave as the reason for his action the fact that the local organs were conducting agitation against him in favor of another candidate—car depot caster S. Kalinov. It is hard to judge how justified the director's decision was. According to party gorkom secretary A. Galkin, the voters had been shown objectively all the "pros" and "cons" of both candidates. But surely this is a matter for the agents, and not for the gorkom? And surely it requires as much tact as possible?

N. Milkova, teacher at the vocational and technical college in the central Urals city of Talitsy, telephoned in perplexity about how long before the elections one candidate figured in the oblast newspaper as "the future deputy." A slip of the tongue? But how are we to assess the leaflet which appeared in another oblast: "By voting for so-and-so you are voting for Soviet power." Please, does that mean your rival is against Soviet power? These "slips of the tongue," which have their origins in times gone by, today generate in people a rightly sharp reaction, particularly if it is a case of an official. An essential condition for our political reform is respect for a person's opinion and stance and his independence in expressing his will.

Elections

The results of the voting have shown that the voters as a rule reject attempts at pressure—both administrative-edict pressure and psychological pressure (from various informal groups). In the majority of cases, those who "tried too hard" in the self-advertisement department did not celebrate a victory. And this, too, is evidence of the democratic self-awareness that is strengthening in society.

Unfortunately, it must be admitted that the party committees, in selecting the forms and methods of their work, often lag behind this process or even simply ignore it. On 21 March, for instance, the aktiv was invited to Svetloyarskiy CPSU rayon committee [raykom], Volgograd Oblast, and each person was presented with a "raykom representative" identification at the elections.

"We were given instructions by Second Secretary Vladimir Stepanovich Vakh," I. Chizhikov, deputy editor of the rayon newspaper, reports. "He said that we must go to the polling stations before the start of the elections and be there until they closed, give consultations to members of the election commission, and also be answerable for the safekeeping of the ballot papers. I and rayon National Education Department Chief L. Sobolev opposed this, and rayon prosecutor A. Mochalov remarked that the law says nothing about authorized agents. To this Vakh said that everyone had become a legal expert and was protesting any raykom decisions, and he cited rulings from above."

We telephoned Igor Vasilyevich Chizhikov. After the intervention of the Central Electoral Commission he was invited to visit raykom First Secretary P. Sidorenko, who apologized for "going too far." But the party committee did not abandon its mission: Its agents went out to the polling stations before daybreak, stayed on duty there until late, and then wrote very detailed "reports...."

It must be said that on election day the telephones in the editorial office range almost nonstop. Now it was reported from a remote town that the booths for secret voting had been installed in contravention of the law. Now a reader from Moscow was complaining that completely different people were registered at his address on the list of voters and they were not crossed off even after it was ascertained there had been a mistake. Now a call would come in that someone had been allowed to vote for his entire family at a polling station. Having cleared up the misunderstanding, ward Electoral Commission Chairman N. Ivanova confided that she was offended: "Why don't they trust us?!" And you can probably see justification in her aggrievedness but there was really also something here to rejoice over.

After all, we have already started to forget how just recently we were oppressed by the universal spiritual fencing-in, how we had almost come to tolerate our own indifference. Yet the elections showed quite obviously that the ice had broken. The law on elections is still imperfect? That won't hold things up; our deputies, having experienced it for themselves, will make the necessary amendments. Defeat was annoying? That means that conclusions must be drawn for the future, since new elections are not far off. The misunderstandings will go away; grievances will be forgotten. But there will remain the only thing which can be the guarantee that our changes are irreversible: The Soviet man's awakened dignity.

Electoral Commission Meets, Reviews Results 4 Apr

18000775 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by A. Murtazayev: "Elected by the People"]

[Text] *Yesterday in Moscow, in the House of Unions there was a meeting of the Central Electoral Commission on elections of USSR People's Deputies.*

V. P. Orlov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, reported on the results of the elections of USSR people's deputies.

Having considered the statements submitted by the corresponding electoral commissions, the Central Electoral Commission registered the USSR people's deputies elected on 26 Mar 1989 in the various territorial and national-territorial electoral districts and the USSR people's deputies from the public organizations. The results of the elections and the lists of elected USSR People's deputies will be published in the press.

And so 1,958 of the 2,250 people's deputies have been elected. It will be necessary to elect another 292 deputies. Including 18 from public organizations, 160 from territorial electoral districts, and 114 from national-territorial electoral districts.

All the speakers at the meeting of the Central Electoral Commission noted that this year's elections have been a large step in the implementation of the political reform earmarked by the 19th all-union party conference. The main result of the elections is that the people have in all ways supported the party policy of restructuring and renewal of the society.

The high degree of activity of the electors is shown by the fact that 172,840,130 people or 89.8 percent of the population participated in the voting. Without any "reminders" of the need to perform their patriotic duty, people came to the polling places in order to support their candidates, those who through their real deeds and active position in life have earned the confidence of the people.

It was noted that the election campaign went very smoothly. There were also mistakes, excessive organization, and attempts to exert pressure on the expression of the will of the people. Each case like this must be evaluated according to principle, and we must not allow for the unconditional success of the electoral campaign to be overshadowed by the negative phenomena reported in the mass media and the letters and telegrams received by the Central Electoral Commission. Yes, the Law on Elections underwent the test of practice, and this provides real paths for its improvement.

In his report on the results of the election V. P. Orlov especially noted the poor knowledge of the Law on Elections by the electors. And even the district electoral commissions sometimes showed their incompetence, which led to many conflicts and complaints made to the Central Electoral Commission, which received a total of 14,500 letters and telegrams.

The indecisiveness of the district electoral commissions was also reflected in the fact that in a number of places there was a real "leaflet war" in which the competitive fervor took hold of the participants to such an extent that sometimes they simply forgot the ethical norms of behavior and the rules of social order. The lack of experience was also reflected in agitation work, but the very desire to achieve victory sometimes at any price could not go unnoticed by the voters. This was confirmed by the elections that have taken place, at which initiators of needless self-advertisement were many votes short.

Participating in the commission meeting were A. I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; T. N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; leaders of public organizations; and representatives of the mass information media.

Commission Report Published

18000774 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by the Central Electoral Commission on the Results of Elections of USSR People's Deputies in 1989]

[Text] Having reviewed protocols of the results of elections submitted by okrug elections commissions, and elections commissions of social organizations, the Central Electoral Commission reports:

Results of Elections in Electoral Okrugs

Voter rolls for elections of USSR people's deputies in electoral okrugs included 192,575,165 voters; 172,840,130 persons, or 89.8 percent, took part in the elections.

In union republics, the following took part in voting: the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]—87.0 percent; the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—93.4 percent; the Belorussian SSR—92.4 percent; the Uzbek SSR—95.8 percent; the Kazakh SSR—93.7 percent; the Georgian SSR—97.0 percent; the Azerbaijan SSR—98.5 percent; the Lithuanian SSR—82.5 percent; the Moldavian SSR—90.5 percent; the Latvian SSR—86.9 percent; the Kirghiz SSR—97.0 percent; the Tajik SSR—93.9 percent; the Armenian SSR—71.9 percent; the Turkmen SSR—96.1 percent; and the Estonian SSR—87.1 percent of voters.

Elections in Territorial Okrugs

With a view to holding elections of USSR people's deputies 750 territorial electoral okrugs were formed in the country. In the okrugs, 1,431 candidates ran for office. In the process, one candidate was put on the ballot in 196 okrugs, two candidates in 473 okrugs, three or more candidates in 81 okrugs.

Elections were held in 749 electoral okrugs. People's deputies were elected in 590 districts. Pursuant to article 60 of the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies repeat elections must be held in 46 okrugs in every one of which more than two candidates were on the ballot, and not a single one was elected.

In 113 electoral okrugs where one or two candidate deputies were on the ballot, the candidates did not secure the necessary number of votes, and were not elected deputies. In one electoral okrug, the okrug elections commission ruled that the election had not taken place because less than one-half of voters on the rolls had taken part in them. Pursuant to article 61 of the Law on

Elections of USSR People's Deputies, repeat elections will be held in all of these okrugs. In one okrug, elections to fill a vacated deputy seat will be held due to the death of the deputy.

Elections in National-Territorial Electoral Okrugs

With a goal of holding elections of USSR people's deputies in the territory of all union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs, 750 national-territorial electoral okrugs were formed. In these okrugs, 1,419 candidate deputies ran for office. In the process, one candidate was on the ballot in 203 okrugs, two candidates in 479 okrugs, and three or more candidates in 68 okrugs.

Elections were held in 748 electoral okrugs. People's deputies were elected in 636 okrugs. Pursuant to article 60 of the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies, repeat elections must be held in 30 okrugs in every one of which more than two candidates were on the ballot, and not a single one was elected.

In 82 okrugs where one or two candidate deputies were on the ballot, the candidates did not secure the necessary number of votes, and were not elected deputies. Pursuant to article 61 of the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies, repeat elections must be held in all of these okrugs.

Reports on the results of elections in every territorial and national-territorial electoral okrug were published in the local press by okrug elections commissions.

Results of Elections in Social Organizations

In the elections of people's deputies by social organizations which have all-union organs, 871 candidates ran for 750 deputy mandates at the congresses and conferences of these organizations, and plenums of their all-union organs. Seven hundred and thirty-two persons were elected deputies. In five social organizations, 18 deputies were not elected. Pursuant to article 61 of the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies, repeat elections will be held in these social organizations.

Reports on the results of elections of USSR people's deputies in all social organizations were published in the press.

Pursuant to article 57 of the Law on Elections, the Central Elections Commission registered all USSR people's deputies elected in electoral okrugs and social organizations.

Out of 2,250 a total of 1,958 USSR people's deputies were elected. Two hundred and ninety-two deputies are yet to be elected, including 160 in territorial electoral okrugs, 114 in national-territorial electoral okrugs, and 18 in social organizations.

Among the deputies elected, there are 334 women, or 17.1 percent; 1,624 men, or 82.9 percent; 365 workers, or 18.6 percent; 219 kolkhoz [collective farm] members, or 11.2 percent. In total, there are 584 workers and kolkhoz members, or 29.8 percent. There are 1,716 CPSU members and candidate members, or 87.6 percent, among the deputies; 242 non-party members, or 12.4 percent; 114 Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] members, or 5.8 percent. Citizens of 60 nationalities of our country were elected to the supreme organ of state power.

Elections of people's deputies have become a major step in carrying out the political reform envisaged by the 19th all-union party conference, a testimony to the further development of socialist democracy, and an important juncture in the political and public life of the country following the path of restructuring.

[Signed] Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies
4 April 1989

Moscow's General Kalinin Interviewed on Election Day
18010474a Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Mar 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Colonel General N. Kalinin, USSR people's deputy elected from the CPSU Central Committee, troop commander of the Moscow Military District, by Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] **On the eve of the elections for the territorial and national-territorial districts our correspondent Lt Col S. Pashayev met with USSR People's Deputy from the CPSU Central Committee, troop commander of the Moscow Military District, Col Gen N. Kalinin.**

[Pashayev] Nikolay Vasilyevich, first of all I wish to congratulate you on your election as USSR people's deputy at the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

[Kalinin] Thank you.

[Pashayev] We have all attentively followed the debates of the candidates and have analyzed their programs and speeches with interest. But now the electoral campaign has come to an end and the people elected from public organizations and future deputies are faced with a large amount of work, during which they will have to translate their promises into concrete actions. I should like to know how, with which particular steps you personally intend to begin your deputy work?

[Kalinin] I should say that I shall not only have to begin work, but continue some as well. The fact is that I am the deputy of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet where I represent the interests of the voters of Bashkiriya. But, of course, the

work of a USSR people's deputy, especially one elected from the Communist Party, has special responsibility. This is a qualitatively different level of authority and duty.

What takes priority for me, a military person? First of all to contribute to the implementation of the points of the 19th all-union party conference concerning reorientation of defense construction toward mainly qualitative parameters. We must keep in mind that this is not a local or one-time action. It will be necessary to scrupulously work out at various levels a complex of measures directed toward improvement of the organizational-staff structure of the troops and their technical supply and increasing the effectiveness of alert duty and the discipline and responsibility. This work has already been started.

[Pashayev] But does all this depend on you?

[Kalinin] A lot of it, in any case. It is important to agitate the people, to encourage them to work in a new way, and, the main thing, to create the necessary conditions for this. It seems to me that we can put significant reserves to work if we grant real independence to the unit commanders in the planning and organization of combat and political training, increase the role of political agencies and the staffs in the life of the troops, strengthen their influence on the training process, and more persistently introduce advanced practice in the organization of combat training. Including using new methods and modern technical means.

I emphasize that in solving all these problems I as a deputy and commander have people to rely on. Under the conditions of restructuring, which is in progress in the Armed Forces, people are beginning to work with confidence and the most energetic, active, resourceful, and responsible officers and warrant officers are making themselves known. For this is their time; today they have the opportunity to realize their potential more completely. Of course such people must be taught and motivated and supported. My idea is to gather them together in an informal meeting, give them the opportunity to speak frankly, complain about the problems that are bothering us military people, and express mature ideas. And, of course, we must help to realize them. For example, I do not think that all of us are working in the ideal way.

[Pashayev] But will some leaders not perceive this as an encroachment on the principle of one-man command?

[Kalinin] I do not think so. Even the most inveterate conservatives must learn a great deal from the example of the party which published the announcement of its electoral commission concerning the results of the voting and thus again convincingly proved its readiness to live according to the laws of restructuring. So under Army conditions glasnost and democracy are needed more than ever before. They do not contradict one-man command; on the contrary, they reinforce it. Therefore in the future we shall continue to increase the authority and effectiveness of general meetings of military servicemen, and to activate the work of public soviets, people's control, courts of honor, and women's soviets. We shall pay more attention to the opinions of party and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Leaque] organizations as well as military collectives when nominating officers.

Of course other problems concern me as well. As a deputy I intend to come out decisively in favor of activating military-patriotic training and for the development and adoption of an effective law on youth, which raises point blank the issue of radical improvement of the preparation of boys and girls for service in the Army and the responsibility for this work, including that of the Army itself.

[Pashayev] Today the public is seriously concerned about the negative phenomena that have become apparent in recent years in Army and Navy collectives. There have also been cases of non-regulation relations in units of the Moscow military district [MVO]. What can be done and is being done in this connection by the MVO command and yourself personally in order to impose order and get rid of that notorious dedovshchina? [bullying]

[Kalinin] In my opinion, the word "dedovshchina" does not reflect the essence of this critical social problem. At the base of it lies not the differences in the ages of the military servicemen, or in any case that is not the main factor. Let us recall that this problem was first defined when in our society along with the loud declarations of the triumph of collectivism there began a process of separation of people, a cult of pressure, and individual well-being began to take form. And according to this psychology, the only way to live better than others was at the expense of others. And this applied to service as well. It was at that time that the degrading name "greenhorn" came into being. But as a result, entire groups were made to oppose one another. First according to time in the service—then it was easier to prove one's mythical privileges, but now it is also according to the national-territorial indicators.

As with any other complex sociopsychological ailment, it is not easy to fight against nonregulation relationships without eliminating the underlying causes. Today officer personnel must fight as hard as they can against this.

[Pashayev] Have you managed to halt the growth of the number of accidents?

[Kalinin] We have. The situation is beginning to get better. But in order to reinforce this tendency, it is necessary to eliminate the conditions under which these negative phenomena are possible—the separation of the people from combat training, the lack of control, and the interruption of classes. In other words, we must bring the

life and activity of the troops strictly in line with the requirements of the regulations. But this is not enough. Following the example of their fathers, in recent years youth have learned to remain silent and avoid conflicts, to put it crudely, not to stick their neck out. Therefore we must use the entire arsenal of educational means to restore and awaken in youth a sense of their own dignity, courage, and readiness to put a stop to any offense. The young soldier must be made to believe that in his commander, political worker, and comrades he will always find understanding and support, participation and assistance.

[Pashayev] A decision has been made for a unilateral reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces by 500,000 men. What problems associated with this step bother you as a deputy and commander?

[Kalinin] People who have devoted their lives to the military service, who have wandered through distant garrisons and posts, have a right to count on not losing out from this situation. We must take into account their interests, needs, and demands as much as possible. The most crucial problem today is housing. The Ministry of Defense has already developed concrete measures for providing apartments for discharged service personnel. We have also received the corresponding assignment. But we must look at things realistically; we cannot get by with our own forces alone, without mutual understanding, and without assistance from party and soviet agencies.

Another problem bothers my colleagues and me to no less a degree: How can we carry out the complicated and responsible tasks assigned to the Armed Forces with the forces and means left to us. We must take into account the fact that the situation in the world is still complicated and contradictory. Of course our peace initiatives and the steps we have taken to meet our partners have made a strong impression in the world community, but so far no steps have been taken to meet us half way. All this makes it incumbent on us not to weaken but to maintain our vigilance and through our labor and our service to provide reliable defense capabilities for the country and combat readiness and combat capability of the Armed Forces.

[Pashayev] Nikolay Vasilyevich, are you not aware from others' words of those problems, primary social ones, that are bothering military servicemen and their families? What concrete measures have been earmarked for the near future for solving them?

[Kalinin] I must say that on the whole in our district we have created fairly good conditions for the life and service of the soldiers. Practically all the combined units and smaller units have their military installations and training facilities corresponding to their work. But the living conditions for the officers, warrant officers, and members of their families actually leave something to be desired. In Moscow alone we have thousands of people waiting for apartments. The situation is no better in other cities and villages. There are not enough kindergartens, schools, medical institutions, cultural facilities, or work places for the wives of servicemen. I think that, displaying a real interest in Army problems, the central press should also discuss them in an open and unprejudiced way. We should think together about what can be done.

As concerns the district command, when forming the plan for construction for this year we looked for additional possibilities of partially eliminating the arrears. It was decided to invest some of the funds initially intended for other facilities in the construction of housing, social, cultural, and domestic facilities.

As the USSR people's deputy from the CPSU I shall try to do everything possible to more fully carry out the orders we have received from the voters. I recall that they were speaking about the need to develop a law on social protection of military service personnel. I am deeply convinced that we should have such a document, and in the form of a law.

[Pashayev] Do you have any wishes to express to the deputies who will be elected on Sunday?

[Kalinin] Only one wish—to support restructuring with deeds, without delay, and to begin friendly joint work for solving the problems that have accumulated in the country.

Latvia's Vagris Answers Voters' Questions 17 Mar

PM0704085589 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 19 Mar 89 pp 1,3

[LATINFORM report: "Democracy for All is the Foundation of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] The ambiguous political situation in the republic that leaves no one indifferent, and the uncommon problems of restructuring in our country are reflected in all their many colors in the public mood and multiplicity of opinions of the many-thousand-strong collective of Riga's state electrical equipment plant [VEF] production association named for V.I. Lenin. This came out in full measure at the meetings between Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and workers, engineers, and technical personnel of the enterprise held 17 March. [passage omitted]

Fitter Raisa Kolosova touched on the question of according the Latvian language state language status:

"Many people regard the wording of the draft law as an encroachment upon Russian and other languages. Older people find it difficult to master Latvian and more time must be provided for this."

"You may submit your proposal to the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. It will be examined without fail. The Law on Languages will in no way encroach upon any other language and will ensure the equality of nations."

Yan Vagris was surrounded by a group of workers. Interrupting one another, they spoke of the need to enshrine the equality of languages in law and suggested that labor collectives themselves be given the right to fix the length of leave. One of them said she wanted housing legislation to be improved, citing the example of her own family, where five people have been living in a single room for many years now. The Central Committee first secretary replied in detail to the comments of the workers and explained his stance on the problems raised by them and other problems facing our society. On questions concerning fair allocation of housing, we will not be waiting for any unionwide solutions, Yan Vagris said. This problem has been discussed within the republic government and work to draft regulations on an informal approach to taking stock of and allocating apartments is already under way. It would clearly be fair, he said, for people who have lived a number of years in poor conditions to receive well-appointed accomodations more quickly while their apartments can be given to those who have only just arrived here. [passage omitted]

The visit to the association ended with a conversation with enterprise veterans.

Yan Yanovich gave his impressions of the CPSU Central Committee plenum that had just finished and then answered numerous questions.

Question: What has been decided regarding the state agro-industrial committee? The all-union committee is being scrapped, but what is going to happen to the republic one?

Answer: Every republic has been given the right to tackle this problem on its own. It will be replaced by some other body, but one with a considerably smaller staff and without the right to interfere in the day-to-day working of farms and enterprises. However, the state order for basic kinds of agricultural products—meat, milk, and grain—will remain for the time being. In the present situation the question of shortage of foodstuffs is not something that can be left unattended.

Question: The social sphere lags behind in both town and country. Its development is being retarded by a lack of construction materials. Is it your opinion that the situation will be rectified in the near future?

Answer: A number of questions are being tackled right now. The possibility of starting up unjustifiably neglected, small brickworks is under consideration. Tile output is increasing. Ways to improve the republic's cement supply are being sought.

Question: The population is worried by the environmental situation in the republic. Some people maintain that the sewage works under construction in Riga will not ensure the complete purification of sewage. At the same time some Swedish companies have expressed a wish to help us and ensure the purity of the Baltic Sea. Could you comment on this?

Answer: The Riga sewage works will operate sufficiently effectively only if the sewage they receive has already undergone preliminarily purification. The enterprises themselves must do this preliminary purification. This question has not to date been solved everywhere. If certain foreign companies are prepared to help us, I do not think we will let the opportunity slip.

Question: We have many laws in force and new ones continue to be drafted. But there is poor enforcement of their observance.

Answer: Perfectly true. In the rule-of-law state which we now wish to create laws must be much more specific. We now appreciate this better than ever before. If the people show their confidence in me and elect me as their USSR people's deputy I will seek to establish clearly defined accountability for violation of the laws and at the same time make the accountability of the state to its citizens the norm.

Question: How do you explain the fact that there are few women USSR candidate people's deputies from our republic?

Answer: I would previously have given a very brief answer: That was the quota we were given. There is now no quota system at all in existence, but democracy has not fully worked . Clearly various public oganizations and party organs too worked poorly during the election campaign. There are few women, workers, and nonparty people among the candidates. We should draw conclusions from this for the future.

One of those present said that at the last gathering of VEF veterans it was decided that during their meeting with the Latvian Communist Party first secretary they should convey their wish that he find the necessary strength in the struggle for restructuring, successfully combine word and deed, which is sometimes very hard, and not begrudge time to bring up the young generation, which has to implement the ideals common to all mankind which their fathers and grandfathers developed and sometimes bore through very diffieult years. As a USSR candidate people's deputy Yan Yanovich was given a number of mandates .

Comrade Vagris thanked the veterans for their good sendoff and wished that the entire VEF collective might revive its association's former glory.

The guest was provided with explanations during his tour of the works by General Director Ivar Brazhis, party committee secretary Oyar Grigans, and leaders of various services and subdivisions of the association.

Ligachev, Baklanov Visit Machine Exhibit 3 Apr
LD0304204289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Comrades Ligachev and Baklanov today visited an exhibition of machinery and equipment delivered by the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry to the agro-industrial complex. It was noted during the look around the exhibition that the technical equipping of collective farms, state farms, and processing enterprises depends to a significant degree on the deliveries and quality of output from that ministry. There is a shortage of electrical motors of various types, especially small power ones, and the industry is not keeping up with those changes taking place in economic and production relations in the agrarian sphere.

Ligachev, Baklanov Attend 5 Apr Brest Zonal Seminar

Leaders Arrive in Brest
LD0504141289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 5 Apr 89

[Excerpts] A zonal seminar-conference opens in Brest today. [passage omitted]

Ligachev, Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary; Baklanov, CPSU Central Committee secretary; and Skiba, chief of the Agrarian Department of the CPSU Central Committee; have arrived in Brest in order to take part in the seminar.

Ligachev Gives Speech at Seminar
LD0504223989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] A conference and seminar on expanding cooperation between industrial and agricultural enterprises and on developing family holdings, collective horticulture, and market gardening opened today in Brest.

[Correspondent Ye.Sinitsyn] Representatives of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Moldavia have come to this city and oblast to exchange experience and to coordinate their actions for carrying out the decisions of the March plenum of the party's Central Committee. It is like a continuation of the work in Omsk. The conference-cum-seminar is opening. Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev and Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov are taking part in it. Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, and ranking local soviet, party, and economic officials are also here.

Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev stressed in his speech that a program for resolute actions by the party in the cause of providing the population with foodstuffs was outlined in the plenum decisions. Diversity of forms in farm management will unleash the initiative of rural workers and will strengthen the connection between town and country. Anatoliy Antonovich Zelenovskiy, first secretary of the Brest oblast party committee, described specific work experience. The conference participants today visited the Brest and Kamenets rayons. Many of them liked, above all, the exhibition of agricultural machinery used on large and small farms. Industrial machinery is competing with self-made equipment which has been operating for several years. [passage omitted] [video shows conference in session with Ligachev addressing it; camera focuses on the other person mentioned; Ligachev is shown among those touring an exhibition of tractors and minitractors]

Brest Seminar Concludes
LD0604174889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Excerpts] Brest: A Zonal Seminar, on problems of the agro-industrial complex, ended here today. The attention of its participants was focused on the practice of expanding economic relations in Belorussia's rural areas. [passage omitted]

Taking part in its work were Comrade Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia; and heads of a number of all-union ministries and departments

Italian Paper Interviews Aleksandr Yakovlev
PM0604145889 Rome L'ESPRESSO in Italian 2 Apr 89 p 47

[Interview with Aleksandr Yakovlev, CPSU Politburo member, by Maurizio Valentini; date, place of interview not given]

[Excerpt] [Introductory passage omitted]

[Valentini] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, the Soviet economy is not going through a very good period: Is your diplomatic offensive vis-a-vis the West not a way of diverting national and international attention away from your troubles?

[Yakovlev] I really do not think so. We are dealing with the economic problems very resolutely: The mid-March Central Committee plenum on agriculture bears witness to this. We are examining a radical reform of price formation: We have acknowledged that the current system has lost its economic raison d'etre. Even such a

difficult measure as the convertibility of the ruble lies in the not too distant future. But it is not enough to set our own house in order: There are problems that affect everyone.

[Valentini] What are they?

[Yakovlev] Economic development has used a consumerist model of nature. We have the resources and technology to take the path of progress consistent with environmental conservation. It seems to me that it is not exclusively our problem: The "common home" can rest on these foundations.

[Valentini] Europe is loyal to the United States: How can the common home be reconciled with this strategic alignment?

[Yakovlev] There is a common legacy that binds Europe together, both in the East and in the West: European history is a model of international political relations. The United States is not excluded from this legacy: The Old World begat the New World.

[Valentini] However, then came the cold war, partitioning, and the Iron Curtain.

[Yakovlev] After the war there was the split between the two Europes. Everyone lost out, however: The arms race destroyed economic resources, but also certain ethical standards in international relations. It must not be forgotten that all this also produced 40 years of peace. It is a characteristic element of European history: It has been built through destruction and has destroyed itself by building. The problem is that this system no longer works.

[Valentini] Why not?

[Yakovlev] Because now, once everything has been destroyed, there would no longer be anything left to build. It is necessary to consider the new, and this is a task that no one country can perform alone. Consider what is already happening to the developing countries: They are stifled by a foreign debt that they will never be able to repay and driven toward an entirely consumerist economic development of environmental resources. East and West must invent a new way of maintaining relations with the impoverished South.

[Valentini] Let us return to more specific matters: The Soviet state budget still does not include military expenditure. Nobody knows how much the USSR spends on arming itself. Do you not consider this an erroneous premise for this new stage in international relations?

[Yakovlev] We will discuss this at the next Supreme Soviet session. I do not believe it is impossible to reach a solution of the problem. I do believe that the publication of such information is not too far away.

Latvian Central Committee Decisions Followed Up

PM0404095589 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 19 Mar 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A routine session of the Central Committee Bureau has examined progress in discussing the decisions of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee January (1989) Plenum in the republic's party organizations.

It was noted that Communists, while fully supporting the decisions of the plenum and their objectivity and constructive thrust, are expressing deep concern at the continuing worsening of interethnic relations and demanding more decisive and purposeful action by the Central Committee and its commissions and departments in carrying out the tasks set by the plenum. Many critical comments and suggestions were addressed to the Central Committee at the plenums of the Daygavpils and Yelgava city party committees [gorkoms], the Oktyabrskiy, Leningradskiy (Riga City), and Kraslavskiy rayon party committees [raykoms], and other party committees.

The polarization of party members on the basis of the various fronts, and their inability—and occasionally also reluctance—to look for mutually acceptable solutions in order to pool efforts to achieve the creative goals of restructuring, are causing party organizations particular concern. Demands are being made that Communists who take part in the activity of the People's Front, the Interfront, and other movements be strictly guided by the CPSU Program and Statutes and by the Leninist understanding of the principle of democratic centralism, that they uphold the party line of renewing society in a consistent and principled way, and that they be more exacting regarding the execution of party decisions.

Much attention is being paid to the provisions of the draft Law on Languages. While recognizing the urgent need to give Latvian state language status, a number of party committees are making substantial additions and changes to the draft under discussion, are warning against haste in this important work, and are demanding that account be taken of the interests of all inhabitants of the republic.

Serious censure is being leveled against the mass media, particularly against a number of youth publications and certain television and radio programs, for biased and one-sided coverage of the processes under way in society—which quite often leads to further exacerbation of the polical situation in the republic. That was how the Daugavpils party committee plenum assessed an article in the newspaper PADOMJU JAUNATNE on 3 March, which openly defamed the gorkom first secretary.

The Central Committee Bureau acknowledged as basically well founded the criticism made of it regarding organizational and ideological support for the implementation of the January plenum's resolution, and instructed Central Committee departments to introduce specific proposals to improve party work, enhance its effectiveness, and step up monitoring and verification of execution in the light of the changed political situation in the republic.

The attention of the Central Committee Ideological Department and its chief, A.Ya. Gruduls, was drawn to the poor monitoring of mass media work and the lack of constructive action in their activity to ensure absolute implementation of the guidelines of the Central Committee January plenum and party decisions.

A.V. Gorbunov, member of the Central Committee Bureau, was instructed during the finalizing of the draft Law on Languages to carefully examine proposals emanating from party committees and to expedite implementation of the plenum's instruction on the constitutional assessment of the activity of Helsinki-86 and the Latvian National Independence Movement.

The Central Committee Department of Organizational and Cadre Work (G.N. Loskutov) is instructed to constantly analyze the resolutions adopted by party meetings, party committees and bureaus, rallies, and meetings of labor collectives during discussion of the proceedings of the Central Committee January plenum, and to elaborate measures to implement the comments and proposals contained in them.

Party gorkoms and raykoms should step up their efforts to unite Communists in primary party organizations in strict accordance with the requirements of the CPSU Statutes and Program, and apply measures of party influence against those who transgress them. In this regard it is deemed expedient to hold discussions with CPSU members involved in the activity of the Latvian People's Front, the Interfront, and other social formations set up during the process of restructuring, and to determine their place and tasks in pursuing the party line. CPSU members' involvement in the activity of newly created public organizations should be carried out with the assent of party committees, and be strictly monitored by them.

It is planned to hold party meetings (March-April) with a uniform agenda entitled "Restructuring Requires Unity of Effort and Action on the Part of Communists" with the aim of consolidating Communists, working people, and the whole population of the republic on a single socialist platform, and removing the impediments to the normal development of the processes of restructuring, particularly in the sphere of interethnic relations.

The resolution specially underlines the duty of party gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations to improve the forms and methods of work aimed at harmonizing interethnic relations, to put a resolute stop to all manifestations of nationalist or chauvinist sentiments, and to show a solicitous attitude toward the development of the national cultures of the republic's inhabitants.

More on 13 Mar Latvian International Front Rally

PM0604151389 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 22 Mar 89 p 4

[V. Dubrovskiy report: " 'We Are Different But We Are Equal'"]

[Text] By the evening of last Monday [13 March], dozens of USSR and Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) state flags, banners, and slogans had been hoisted on the crowded platforms of the Army stadium in Riga. A rally involving thousands was being held here, convened by the Proletarskiy Rayon Soviet of the International Front.

...The national anthems of the country and the republic were played. Those present paid their respects to the memory of the victims of Stalin's repressions with a minute of silence. Then began the discussion of the matters which now concern workers, engineers, teachers, and doctors—in other words, everyone living in our republic.

As at the previous rally in Moskovskiy Rayon, the speakers discussed their support for the decisions of the January plenum of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the problems of real bilingualism in the republic and demanded that a rebuff be given to provocateurs inflaming interethnic discord.

People spoke with concern of the need to do everything possible to stop the negative trends which have recently appeared in social life. You could also read about this on the numerous banners: "We are different but we are equal," "We want equality, justice, and unity of all languages and peoples! We want honesty and truthfulness from the television and the press," "Knowledge of the Latvian language is the way to unity," and "Do not divide us and our children on ethnic grounds."

Those present sharply criticized the lack of objectivity of a number of the mass media and the not always justified attempt to divide two-stream schools, voiced concern for the future of children who have been drawn into the acts of political speculation of individual groups and people, and approved an open letter to V. Korotich, chief editor of the journal OGONEK. The rally participants expressed their support for the labor collectives of Estonia and Lithuania which are defending their constitutional and civil rights.

The resolution unanimously adopted by all present notes, in particular, that "We support the party stand regarding the assessment of the situation in the republic...and consider the hasty discussion and possible adoption of a draft law on languages inadmissible. We

demand that the drafting of such a law be postponed until the CPSU Central Committee plenum on ethnic issues. A state program of language study should be drafted." The rally participants spoke in favor of the unconditional implementation of the decisions of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee January plenum and urged active involvement in the forthcoming elections of USSR people's deputies.

The rally also adopted a number of other resolutions.

Latvian International Front Newspaper Launched

PM0404131889 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 24 Mar 89 p 3

[A. Vladimirov report: "YEDINSTVO"]

[Text] That is the title of the information bulletin of the International Front of Working People of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] [Interfront], whose first issue reached readers on 22 March.

The newspaper opens with an appeal from the crew members of the factory ship RMTS-7526 "Ioakhim Vatsiyetis" to the members of the Latvian People's Front Duma and its chairman D. Ivans to help lessen tension in ethnic relations. The weekly carries a wide range of letters from the republic's working people, in which they share their ideas on various aspects of public life. The issue carries an alternative draft Latvian SSR Law on Languages, drafted by the Interfront Council.

Under the heading "Against Monopolism," there are the reflections of Professor N. Ilichev, doctor of philosophical sciences, on the extraordinary congress of the Latvian SSR Journalists' Union. The political situation in Latvia and its prospects are discussed in an article by I. Podvoyskiy. L. Mikhaylov's poem "Conversation With Comrade Stalin" is devoted to the memorial day for the victims of Stalinism.

YEDINSTVO is printed at the Daugavpils Printing Plant in a run of 40,000 copies, and is distributed through Interfront rayon councils and primary organizations at enterprises and institutions.

Latvian Creative Unions Discuss Human Rights

PM0304123989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Plenum of Creative Unions"]

[Text] Riga, 30 Mar—A 2-day plenum of the boards of the republic's creative unions began a discussion here today of the problems of human rights and peoples' rights in light of the Vienna conference's final document. Prominent international law specialists from Moscow, other union republics, and foreign countries are taking part. The Latvian population is following the plenum's progress by means of live radio and television broadcasts.

Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium; and V.G. Bresis, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers; are taking part in the plenum.

Latvian Front Petitions for Citizenship Law

LD0604151689 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2030 GMT 5 Apr 89

[Text] The political committee of the board of the People's Front of Latvia Duma appeals to the republican government to more quickly adopt the law on Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] citizenship. It is emphasized in the statement that the status of citizenship must not allow any kind of discriminatory norms with regard to any nationality. A person's actual and stable bond with Latvia must form the basis of citizenship. In a statement by the political committee of the board of the People's Front of Latvia Duma it is emphasized that Latvia's standing as a union republic of completely equal rights within the USSR can be legally founded only by a signed union treaty, which will have been ratified by the Latvia SSR's highest organ of power, or which would be confirmed by a popular ballot.

Estonia's Ryuytel Speaks on 1949 Deportations

PM0604131389 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 24 Mar 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Speech by A. Ryuytel (chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium) on Estonian television"; date not given]

[Text] Esteemed residents of Estonia, whose lives and destinies are inseparably bound with the republic!

I address you at a time when our common duty and spiritual needs make it incumbent upon us to recall the grave injustice which befell the Estonian people 40 years ago—the mass deportation of innocent people on 25 March 1949.

We can cite many other examples to show that the period of Stalinism throughout the Land of the Soviets was accompanied by social injustice, repressions, a negative and scornful attitude toward human dignity, the resettlement of entire peoples and ethnic groups, the destruction of their culture and of the creators and custodians of these cultures, and violence against nature, man, and his beliefs.

All this has been fairly and irreversibly condemned today; it must never recur.

Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of humanism, the crimes committed in 1940-1950 will always remain fresh in people's memories.

That is why the lessons of those years, which must be learned by many peoples, are also abiding.

After all, Estonia, where tens of thousands of people—crop farmers, mothers, members of the intelligentsia, old people, and children—were torn away from the hearth and home created with such hard labor 4 decades ago, was not the only one to suffer under the heel of Stalinism.

Our common duty is to remember those terrible trials and to honor the memory of those for whom this path meant death.

It is our sacred duty to the people and to history to restore truth and make it fully subject to glasnost.

This will also be a precondition for ensuring that nothing similar can ever again recur.

Everything is being done in Estonia to ensure that truth is presented accurately and clearly.

During the past year we have taken a series of important steps to ensure our national self-determination and equality, restored our right to our own history and symbols, and tried to compensate for the consequences of voluntarism.

Last december the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet adopted a law on extrajudicial mass repressions in Soviet Estonia in 1940-1950.

It totally and unreservedly condemned the extrajudicial mass repressions and deemed them unlawful actions directed against humanity.

By virtue of this law, all persons exiled to special settlements were rehabilitated, with the ensuing legal consequences.

The republic government was instructed to elaborate procedures for paying compensation to persons who suffered from extrajudicial mass repressions.

The Estonian SSR Council of Ministers adopted an appropriate resolution 20 February this year.

By way of a legislative initiative, that same session submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium a draft law "On Extrajudicial Mass Repressions During the Period of Stalinism" in order to provide a unionwide juridical assessment of mass repressions and deem them crimes against humanity.

Last January the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decree on additional measures to restore social justice for the victims of repressions and to eliminate the consequences of illegality.

We recall the grim past of the Estonian people at a time of serious deeds.

In a few days' time we will go to the ballot boxes to express our will at elections for the supreme organ of power in the USSR.

Preparation is under way all over the country for an exceptionally important CPSU Central Committee Plenum on questions of interethnic relations. At the same time, we in our republic feel the tension in interethnic relations, analyze the causes, and seek solutions.

A concept of Estonian self-management, and much else, is under elaboration.

Socialism has given us an opportunity to create a state community which is based on all nations' mutual respect for one another, and which respects the history, culture, language, and customs of each individual people.

Those selfsame ideals of socialism now call upon us to say a firm "No" to extremists of any nationality whose chauvinist habits and nationalism threaten and insult the dignity of the indigenous population and hinder the cultural self-assertion of other nationalities.

We say "No" to everything that diverts us from the path of restructuring and glasnost, from the line mapped out at the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee 11th and 13th Plenums.

On behalf of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the republic government I appeal to all of Estonia's inhabitants to remember with respect the fate, courage, and staunchness of all who were forcibly torn away from their sacred motherland under the heel of Stalin's tyranny in the spring of 1949.

We are still aware within our souls that atonement can be provided not by material compensation for injustice, not by some document testifying to rehabilitation, but only by the truth made known to every member of society and by nationwide recognition of this truth.

We simply have no right to shut our eyes to the truth, no matter how bitter it might be.

Now we are also living in uneasy times, but we must retain calmness and composure.

A sense of dignity can be possessed only by a people who have not been crushed by pain and injustice and who continue, with that much more love and perseverance to labor, to protect and safeguard their language, their culture, and their home.

Source of Anonymous Posters in Lithuania Sought
LD0404045289 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] The procurator general has started investigations of anonymous posters in Russian. This poster was published by the popular weekly GIMTASIS KRASTAS. The photo illustrates the activities of the jingoist Yedintsvo organization. The above poster carries the following text in Russian: "Russians' (?flag). Under the flag of great Russia we shall overpower Lithuania. Only a dead Lithuanian is good. Fight for Yedinstvo." These words were painted white on a black background.

The copies of this poster were sent to such public organizations as, for instance, the Writers' Union. The procurator general considers the step as an attempt to fan up hatred and hostilities among nations. Such activities are banned by law and the guilty ones will be brought to trial.

News Conference Held on Ukraine Chernovtsy Illness
18000752 Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Feb 89 p 4

[Article by V. Nazarchuk: "Chernovtsy: The Next Examination"]

[Text] **A news conference was held in Chernovtsy by members of the Medical Commission of the USSR Ministry of Health and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Health devoted to childrens' chemical intoxication illnesses.**

We came here, said G. Razumeyeva, the chief of the main administration of preventive medicine assistance to children and mothers of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Health, as was planned earlier, to conduct the next examination of children afflicted with chemical intoxication. All the members of our group have already been in Chernovtsy. These, mainly, are those physicians who treated children from Chernovtsy in clinics in Kiev. They know each child well, and they are therefore qualified to judge how they are convalescing. Specialists examined all of the children afflicted with chemical illness, and also those who were diagnosed as having "spotty baldness." In their opinion, the condition of the children who suffered chemical intoxication is satisfactory. The hair is growing back. But the situation is complicated by the fact that a substantial part of the Chernovtsy inhabitants associate any illness with the chemical factor. A unique kind of chemo-phobia has surfaced. In addition, the opinion has been spread around that the physicians are trying to conceal the real state of affairs under pressure from oblast and city managers. However, the publication of new data on the number of children ailing from chemical intoxication (as we have already reported, this figure has increased from 132 to 150) has only reinforced this opinion.

Our members of the commission on statistical changes make explanations by means of an objective factor—the so-called retrospective diagnosis clarification. After a careful examination in Moscow and Kiev clinics, the diagnosis was changed.

With respect to "spotty baldness," physicians assert the following: 117 patients were recorded with these symptoms in the oblast in 1988, including 87 in Chernovtsy. Thirty-three such patients have already been found in January and February. This is more than in the last year. Specialists attribute spotty baldness to the increasing alarm of the people. Now a slight departure from the norm compels parents to turn to physicians.

As for the ecological situation in Chernovtsy, it has completely normalized, in the opinion of Ya. Mazurkevich, head of the inorganic chemistry department at Chernovtsy University, and P. Kaspruk, chairman of the Chernovtsy city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom]. To establish an objective picture of environmental conditions, the university has obtained two atomic-absorption installations, which will make it possible to make an on-site analysis of specimens with great accuracy. An ecological laboratory has been created. Findings show that the content of heavy metals in the water is 8-10 times lower than the maximum permissible concentration. The soil is characterized by an overall heavy metals contamination factor on the order of from 1 to 2, and even 3, standard background readings. The overall contamination factor on the territory of a number of enterprises and adjacent sanitary zones still exceeds the maximum permissible concentration by 2 to 10 times.

The dust content of the air is from 1 to 1.5 PDK [maximum permissible concentration] in the absence of heavy metals. So it is necessary to continue washing the streets. As P. Kaspruk reported, 28 watering vehicles are being used, and 3 trolley buses are being re-equipped, but on the whole, there is not enough equipment.

With respect to the source of contamination, nothing specific was said at this time either. But the press conference participants took into consideration the report of Public Prosecutor G. Ivasyuk, chief of the investigations department, that after 2-3 weeks the investigation into the fact of childrens' illnesses, over which criminal proceedings have been instituted, will be completed and conclusions will be drawn accordingly.

Jewish Culture Society Formed in Moldavia
LD0304120389 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Kishinev April 3 TASS—The Moldavian Jewish Culture Society, formed here on Sunday [2 April], will bear the name of well-known Jewish writer Cholom Aleichem.

The society will promote the revival and development of Jewish culture in Moldavia and enable better mutual understanding between the peoples inhabiting the USSR, it was stated at a constituent meeting on Saturday.

The society plans to organise classes on Yiddish and Ivrit, history and culture. It also plans to issue a newspaper, to produce TV and radio programmes, to open a book and a record libraries, a cafe with Jewish national cuisine, to organise lectures and exhibitions, and to do charity work.

Branches of the society are to be established in different cities of Moldavia, which has a Jewish population of 80,000.

Writer and member of the SOVETISCH HEIMLAND journal editorial board Boris Sandler, and composer Vladimir Bitkin have been elected co-chairmen of the society's board.

Volga Germans Seek Rights Within Soviet Union

PM0604152989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 89 p 2

[G. Agisheva report: "... But the People Remain"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The constituent conference of the Society of Soviet Germans completed its work in Moscow yesterday.

Soviet Germans have come to Moscow—135 participants in all. Their aim: to draw up and adopt a unified, consolidating program and unite all patriotic forces among Soviet Germans to recover their constitutional rights and revive the former Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Volga Germans.

This autonomy existed until 28 August 1941—until Stalin's decree "On the Resettlement of Germans Living in the Volga Regions." We will quote two paragraphs from this decree.

"According to reliable information received from the military authorities, among the German population living in the Volga regions there are thousands and tens of thousands of saboteurs and spies who, on a signal from Germany, are to carry out explosions in the regions populated by Volga Germans.

"None of the Germans living in the Volga regions has informed the Soviet authorities of the existence of this large number of saboteurs and spies among the Volga German population and, consequently, the German population of the Volga regions is concealing in its midst enemies of the Soviet people and Soviet power," and so on in the same vein.

What came after this is a well-known fact. But despite this—just to make it totally clear, so to speak—we will follow the fate of Eduard Ferdinandovich Ayrikh, who is now a distinguished Soviet coach who has been awarded the Order of the Peoples' Friendship.

He was born in the Volga region, studied at a technical school in the city of Marks, and then, in 1935, was sent to the Volga Military Aviation School on a special Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee recruitment program. In 1940 he joined the party. But in 1941, when his contemporaries were volunteering for service at the front, he and his wife and child were moved to Krasnoyarsk Kray. In March 1942 he was sent to the northern Urals as a member of the labor army. He worked in the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs "Bazstroy" Corrective Labor Camp (the Bogoslovskiy Aluminum Plant) at Mednaya Shakhta Station. His wife, a teacher by profession, spent 4 years at a fish enterprise in Turukhansk.

"We held our party meetings behind the barbed wire," Eduard Ferdinandovich said. "The labor army was disbanded in 1946, but we were told that we could only live in Krasnoturinsk." A 26 November 1948 decree assigned him and others to stay there forever....

"A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree states that Germans, Kalmyks, Ingush, Chechens, Finns, Latvians, and others are to be resettled in the appointed regions forever and that their departure from the places of settlement without special authorization from the Ministry of Internal Affairs bodies will be punished by hard labor for a period of up to 20 years."

This procedure was gradually relaxed, but it took many years. A decree of 13 December 1955 abolished the special settlements but did not permit people to return to their homes. It only became possible to return home in 1964.

It is not hard to guess what people discussed at the conference. The loss of their traditional language and culture. An administrator at the National German Drama Theater from Temirtau, Yakov Fisher, said:

"Last year 10,000 Germans left Karaganda for the FRG. That is terrible. Many of my own relatives have left. People close to me also feel like doing the same. I say to them: Wait a while, justice will triumph. Working people are leaving, and they are worth their weight in gold. Even those who want to live here, because their roots are here and the graves of their ancestors are here, are leaving."

Gerold Karlovich Belger, a writer from Kazakhstan, said:

"A geographer in France asked me: 'Why do you need the desolate lands of the Volga region? Go and live in the fatherland.' But I do not want to. I want to live here, where I was born and grew up and graduated from a

Kazakh school. Because a famous poet who said that 'for a person, nationality is neither a merit nor a source of blame....' was right. I will make one thing clear, which I should probably have done earlier: The demands made by Soviet Germans contain not a hint of any extremism. We do not intend to squeeze citizens of other nationalities out of their homes. On the contrary, we all believe that we will live in harmony together, because—and we say this with pride—we know how to work."

New Georgian Party Official Elected
LD0604181389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1752 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Sukhumi, 6 Apr (TASS)—A plenum of the Abkhaz Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia was held today. It discussed an organizational matter.

The plenum released B.V. Adleyba from the post of first secretary of the oblast party committee. V.F. Khishba was elected first secretary of the Abkhaz Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia; he previously worked as first deputy chairman of the State Committee of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] for protection of nature and forestry.

Earthquake Commission Meets in Yerevan 3 Apr
LD0304180989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] An operational meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission was held in Yerevan today, chaired by Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

It discussed the program for the immediate future of Leninakan and Kirovakan. Restoration work in the central areas and the construction of residential areas of these towns was analyzed in detail. Reports were heard from responsible officials of the Armenian State Committee for Construction, the chairmen of the executive committees of Leninakan and Kirovakan, and heads of staff of the Ukraine and Belorussia, who reported on the state of affairs concerning this matter.

Criticism was expressed toward the heads of union industries and town authorities. The commission entrusted the Council of Ministers of the republic with approving an all-around plan for Leninakan and Kirovakan by 20 April within the limits of the amount of finance allocated for the aforementioned work up to the end of next year.

In order to fully implement the work in these towns, it was decided to set up specialized repair and construction organizations, and to give them the function of general subcontractor in these areas.

The Armenian State Committee for Construction is obliged to complete the elaboration of detailed plans for the large residential area of (Marmashen), in Leninakan, in April, and the Main Directorate for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments must provide a basis for the Kumayri architectural heritage area, the old center of this ancient town. The Committee of People's Control of the republic has been tasked with checking the work of the Oktemberyan building works and the Items combine of the (Oktektov) Association for the first quarter of the year by 15 April and of reporting back to the commission on the results of its check.

Comrade Aryutunyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia, took part in the meeting.

Armenia's Arutyunyan Chairs Reconstruction Meeting
NC0604164989 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, chaired a meeting on 5 April during which the issue of quality control in the construction of houses and sociocultural centers in the earthquake areas was discussed. During the meeting, Kolmogorov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Standards, proposed the introduction of state supervision and quality control over the buildings being constructed. Particular attention was given to the procurement of quality building materials and building structures, to the need to supervise the maintenance of a technological construction standard, and ensure a high standard regarding the anti-seismic reliability and sturdiness of the buildings, and to the procurement of high-quality work in furnishings. The need for the creation of permanent mobile labs for quality control was discussed during the meeting, and it was also proposed that measures introducing state quality control be instituted in the near future, starting with the buildings being erected in Leninakan, Korovakan, Stepanavan, and Spitak.

Present at the meeting were Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; Dayan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers; (Belichen,) member of the Collegium of the USSR State Committee for Standards; and (Chidedzhyan,) chairman of the Armenian Republic's department under the USSR State Committee for Standards.

Stalinist Views on WWII, German Pact Discussed
18300491 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 25 Mar 89 p 10

[Article by A. Mertsalov, doctor of historical sciences: "A Shadow Over History"]

[Text] Stalin and those close to him had to conceal or justify their grossest blunders in domestic and foreign policy, in the economy, and in military construction on the eve of and during the war. The propaganda, which relied on terror, made up any ideas that were convenient.

These ideas are alive to this day and—which is especially intolerable—they are shared by many historians. Along with the new articles in newspapers and magazines they continue to publish books and articles written in the old traditions.

Let us open up, for example, the materials from the conference "40 Years of the Great Victory" (1987), the reference dictionary "The Great Patriotic War" (1988), and many articles in the military historical journal. A surprisingly similar style is used in certain historical memoirs which, judging from the readers' letters, the people believe in more than they do in scientific monographs. And here one automatically asks the question: Is such confidence always justified? Thus in his notes "In the Name of Victory" (1988) the people's commissar of arms during the war years, L. F. Ustinov, stated that there was a disparity between Leninism and the practice of the "leader," but he adds the sacramental "sometimes" although the inappropriateness of this reservation is obvious today. Among the "strong aspects of the personality" of Stalin, the author includes this: "confidence in the members of the Politburo." Yet in reality everyone close to Stalin was enmeshed in a dense network of informers who directly informed him of the state of affairs in one branch or another, bypassing its leader. Where is the "confidence" here....

In modern literature about the war quite frequently one finds passages borrowed directly from Stalin's speeches. The compilers of the 12-volume "History of World War II" essentially adopted his much-vaunted judgments about the pact with Germany of 23 August 1939, and yet we never tire of repeating that it is the duty of the historian to investigate events objectively. But can our science, in which blind faith prevails, really boast about objectiveness? We cannot yet give final judgments about many aspects of the pact of 23 August. And it is obvious that the available facts do not fit the divergent theories. For instance, can one assert that the USSR had no other choice than a pact with Germany? After all, we had not studied the possible alternatives which existed even at that time which was so difficult for the country. None of our scholars has specifically studied whether or not, in the event that the USSR refused to sign the pact, there would inevitably be an attack on our country from the fascist bloc or even the bloc of all imperialist powers; and which side could derive and actually did derive greater advantage from the signed agreement.

A cloud of silence continues to hang suspended over these questions, but time after time the assertion is repeated that the pact was for the USSR an irreproachable step or, conversely, that the pact was a gross mistake on the part of Stalin and Molotov. But can we really not say that the mistakes related to the pact began only after it was signed? But to do this we must also study this question: For what reasons did our country end up in political isolation in the summer of 1939, which justified a pact even with fascist Germany? In any event, is it possible to deny the possibilities of a pact just because other politicians were unable to take advantage of them? Many other questions are also unclear. For example, in Stalin's decision about the pact what role was played by his failure to understand the specific nature of the fascist form of imperialism, his Anglophobia, and his fear of German power, whether it be real or imagined?

In interpreting the causes of the defeat of the Red Army in 1941-1942 many military historians again utilize the version of the generalissimo, the thesis about the "treacherous," sudden attack. Although it is clear that Stalin and his followers spoke about the "suddenness" in general, without mentioning its sources: in all ways avoiding an analysis of the causes of the unpreparedness of the Army and its leadership for immediate effective actions, that is, directly avoiding the issue of the guilt of Stalin and his advisers. And the latest works still contain Stalin's questionable arguments about the military and technical superiority of the Wehrmacht over the Red Army on 22 June 1941 and Germany's utilization at that time of the entire military and economic potential of the countries which it had seized or which were dependent on her. No less questionable are the points about the mobilization of the Wehrmacht and its military experience (what was keeping the Red Army from having either one?), and the unexpectedly rapid defeat of France and the lack of a second front (why did our defense have to depend on anybody's stability or kindness?). To this day one encounters reverberations of Stalin's dishonest attempts to shift his guilt to the "undisciplined Red Army men and their commanders" and to the "frightened intellectuals" and also the entire pseudo-scientific version according to which certain "aggressive nations" were better prepared for war than "peace-loving nations."

During the years of stagnation military historians tried to improve on Stalin's clearly absurd viewpoint. They accepted the concept of "objective" (major) and subjective (secondary) reasons for the defeat of the Red Army. But with an attentive examination all "objective" factors go back to mistakes of Stalin and his advisers. The Soviet Union had every opportunity to meet the aggressor in a worthy manner and win with little bloodshed.

Official historians have mindlessly used as a basis for their periodization of the war Stalin's words, that were widespread at the time, "a year of radical change" (1943), leaving the great battle of Moscow outside the struggle for strategic initiative.

Approaches to the past conditioned by Stalinism do the greatest harm to the creation of an objective and complete picture of the war. Stalinism, as we know, found its criminal manifestation in the political, economic, ideological, moral, and military spheres. But Stalinism is also a particular methodology which deprives social science of its main social function, for it has ceased to study the experience of the past and draw lessons from it, and has become a servant of propaganda, discarding everything that does not correspond to the current interests of the

regime. A paradoxical symbiosis of apologetics and nihilism is typical of Stalinist methodology: deliberately derogating the thesis of the hero and the crowd, this methodology personifies history to the detriment of the analysis of the role of the masses. The antitheoretical nature, the simple-mindedness, the replacement of scientific thinking with ordinary thinking, of historical fact with mythology, the reduction of the essence of a phenomenon to one of its features, and the appeal to old cultures, particularly heathen ones (the cult of the Father, sacrifice, and so forth)—these are its features. Prohibitions in the elucidation of history have generated considerable illusions among the people, including on those stories of the social edifice where the destiny of the country is decided.

In literature on war Stalinism has transformed the legitimate pride of the winner into dangerous self-satisfaction. This is the type of literature that has fed and still does feed anti-restructuring phenomena. The need to study alternatives of historical development has caught the majority of scholars unawares—they have simply not learned to do this. The backwardness of their methodology is also reflected in their attitude toward historical sources. In a large percentage of the memoirs, sometimes in spite of the authors' will, the Brezhnev-Suslov idea of war prevails. The concept of "literary source" has appeared along with the practice related to it: the historian creates his own "works" by rewriting what has already been published, at the same time appropriating the low level of interpretation.

A real scourge to science has been the endless repetition of what has already been said and what is simply banal under the guise of "comprehensive," "monographic," and "dissertation research." Subjects that were studied long ago are planned from year to year. The most convenient from the standpoint of the scholar-bureaucrat and scholar-dependent are multivolume works. For instance, the Nauka publishing house has prepared a three-volume work about Soviet rear forces. But what new information can it contribute to our knowledge about the war?

Bowing before the "Great Military Leader," a member of the war council of the Ukrainian front, and chief of the political division of the 18th Army, is characteristic of official historiography. No, I am against giving the palm to writers who extol Brezhnev's literary work. Historians have competed successfully with him. In the academic publication "A Study of Domestic History of the USSR Between the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses" (1982), the brochure "The Bridgehead" was called a "great event" that was of "great political, educational, and scientific-historical significance." A similar tendency can be traced in current publications. The reference dictionary that was mentioned contains biographies of current leaders who had nothing to do with the last war.

For many years our science suffered from obvious one-sidedness. It was considered simply unseemly to study the opponents. As a result there appeared a historical description not of the war in all of its tragic completeness, but only the USSR participation in it. Such an approach entails other mistakes as well. Thus factors involved in the victory have been elucidated one-sidedly, frequently from positions of a vulgarized class approach. The advantages of socialism only were declared, and historiography has not shown their concrete realization. Up to this point we have not revealed the military and economic opposition between the USSR and Germany.

In spite of the abundance of works on specific, less significant subjects (perhaps even because of this), we have not yet resolved a number of important problems: What was the relationship between the quantity and quality of arms and military equipment of the Red Army and the eastern front of the Wehrmacht on 22 June 1941? What did it cost the people to evacuate the productive forces to safe regions of the country, and so forth?

Historiography essentially elucidates only the heroic side of the war while remaining silent about the negative phenomena. There is no analysis of USSR foreign policy before and during the war; they continue to consider it irreproachable. In recent years in the press there has been extremely convincing evidence that Stalin's international policy was a policy of forfeited opportunities of avoiding war (see KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, No 21, 1988).

The political harm from certain of Stalin's public speeches is obvious. Such is his thesis about the "decisive weight" (1925) which he places on the military scale at the critical moment of the war among the imperialists, and comes out the winner. Apologists of the "leader" enthusiastically write about his ability to beat certain enemies with the hands of others, but this is one of the numerous myths about the leader. In reality the thesis about the "weight" helped Stalin to achieve only one thing: For decades his ideological opponents used it against the USSR. And the role of the "happy bystander" was assigned not to us (the USSR lost more than 20 million, the United States—405,000, and England—375,000). An immense amount of harm was caused to the international position of the USSR by Stalin's repressions of the 1930's-1950's, including those against foreign antifascists and even against entire communist parties. This damage can be traced in the political, economic, military, and moral spheres. But the very mechanism of influence of this position of Stalin's has not yet been studied.

Obviously the waging of war in the broadest sense of this word, encompassing more than just combat activities, which was inherent in Stalinism has been studied even less. At best the reader encounters certain remarks about "mistakes" Stalin made during the war years. In essence this is a more or less masked rehabilitation of him, when

the victory of the people is attributed to the wisdom of the person at the helm. Certain military historians openly defend Stalin, crediting him with infallible leadership during 1943-1945, mentioning his "coming closer" to the people toward the end of the war, and so forth. And they justify the excessive centralization and the cruelty by the conditions of the war, sometimes according to the principle of "the winner is not judged." In words this idea was condemned by the supreme commander himself, but in essence it pervaded all propaganda when an important victory was used as an indulgence for the leader for all of his previous repressive measures.

In reality the repressive measures during the war years not only continued but even increased. The complete disdain for human life that was typical of Stalin and those around him was obviously manifested most strongly during the war. First of all it is necessary to recall those cruel measures applied by Stalin in order to compensate for the extremely severe consequences of his political mistakes. And it seems that this is by no means a reaction to a disastrous situation. Customary, tested methods were put to use. I shall mention just two of Stalin's odious orders: No 270 of 1941 and No 227 of 1942. The first of these declared all members of the Red Army who had been taken prisoner, mainly by the fault of the commanders, to be "traitors." Their families were also subjected to repressive measures. This order compromised the Soviet state and contradicted international law. To this day we have not eradicated the equation of the concepts "to be taken prisoner" and "to surrender."

The second order reflected Stalin's desire to escape the blame for the death of hundreds of thousands of Red Army soldiers on the southern flank of the front. Heavy responsibility was placed on both the living and the dead. Following Hitler's example (this was cynically emphasized by Stalin himself) the generalissimo introduced penal battalions and barrage detachments, and, later, death by hanging. This order was detrimental in the purely military respect as well. The demand "not a step backward" (without permission from Moscow) hampered the initiative of the commanders of all levels, from the platoon to the front, contradicting the requirements of maneuver warfare and only increasing the meaningless losses of the "live force."

The incompetence of the highest leadership was manifested in the most varied forms. When selecting commanders and political workers precedence was frequently given to considerations related to social origin, "class sensitivity," devotion to the "cause of Stalin," and the ability to carry out any orders without thinking. Right up until the end of the war the supreme commander rudely intervened in the affairs of the general staff and the command of the front and the Army. This was pointed out by G.K. Zhukov in a letter to the writer V.D. Sokolov and by K.M. Simonov in his polemic with the sculptor Ye.V. Buchetich. The example of the supreme commander was also followed by some of the lower commanders who were not very much concerned about the soldiers. Who does not know of cases where a platoon or battalion were sent to certain death—to take some unimportant hill, to rescue artillery weapons left during retreat, and so forth?

But is the history of the home guard filled with tragic losses? In available literature, for instance in the book by A.D. Kolesnik, it is dealt with more than one-sidedly.... For nobody thought about how much it would cost to take highly skilled specialists away from the national economy. The home guard meant not only exceptional readiness for self-sacrifice, but also thoughtless exploitation of this readiness.

In literature about the war as in no other area of our historiography a sectarian attitude, cultivated by Stalinism, toward non-Marxist historical science still dominates. A comprehensive picture of the war cannot be reconstructed without collaboration with foreign historians, mainly West German and American. Yet following the compilers of the aforementioned 12-volume edition, which regards as "reactionary" all non-Marxist scientific literature, the authors of a number of publications continue to mark the works of foreign historians as falsifying. In contrast to such books is the new work of Academician A. M. Samsonov, "Memory of the Past" (1988). It generalizes the experience of the fruitful contacts between this Soviet specialist on the history of the war, who is known both in our country and abroad, and J. Erikson (England), G. A. Jakobsen (FRG), and many other scholars.

And one more important consideration. The discussion in the press of the problems of the war has revealed the low level of our debating skills. The authors of a number of letters, in response to the article by Academician Samsonov in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, essentially take advantage of a wretched device: "ad hominem." For example, A. G. Khorkov concentrates attention on the "pre-restructuring content" of the article by his opponent, without mentioning a word about the essence of the questions that are raised. N. Zaytsev in MOLODAYA GVARDIYA (1988, No 8) "has doubts about A. M. Samsonov's disagreement with the thesis of the 'Great Military Leader,'" but also avoids an analysis of this argument.

Everything that has been said leads us to the conclusion that the proposal of the former leadership of the Institute of Military History concerning the publication of a 10-volume work on the history of the Great Patriotic War before 1995 does not have serious scientific substantiation. We cannot demand the impossible from a group of military historians. Even if the necessary documents are immediately taken from the archives, the majority of historians of the old school are still methodologically unprepared for carrying out this extremely difficult task.

Recently more and more frequently one hears the justification that the fruitless articles of the years of stagnation are the responsibility of the former leaders who "did not lay claim" to scientific thought. But will everything not be repeated all over again if again we blame the "fathers"? It is important to increase the responsibility of the new generation of historians. Should not the leaders of the 12-volume edition and of each of its volumes return the awards and prizes they have received undeservedly? This would also be a good incentive for the creators of the new 10-volume edition.

But their current position is alarming for, while recognizing individual shortcomings, none of them want to radically revise their approaches. The creators of the 10-volume edition are ignoring the serious criticism of the concepts they have developed.

The main editorial board is comprised mainly of high officials who have never worked on the historiography of the war. Is it able to provide professionally literate leadership? Military historians, loudly advertising the 10-volume edition, has not yet created a single substantial article or review. In keeping with its plans, the military publishing house has prepared and in 1989 will begin to publish a multivolume series of monographs about the battles and the most important operations of the last war. Under these conditions the only logical thing to do would be simply to publish a book on the most crucial problems that are not reflected in the series. This would include essays on the history of the war similar to those planned by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee on party history. It did not intend to publish a "jubilee" monument and it did not announce the date of publication, as is the practice in real scholarship. Work on the 10-volume edition should also be preceded by the curtailment of the output of dull books, the publication of documents and unfalsified memoirs, and the creation of a competent and working editorial board.

Deputy Prosecutor Discusses Rising Crime Rate

18000705 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Mar 89 First Edition p 4

[Interview with A. F. Katusev, USSR deputy prosecutor general, by G. Ovcharenko; date, place not given]

[Text] *"Finally the crime figures have begun to 'speak,' but they are not gratifying: crime is on the rise! But here is what is surprising: the figures show an increase in all kinds of legal violations except for...bribery, grand larceny, extravagance, and misappropriation of state and public property. Is it true that in the fight against so-called management or economic crimes a long-awaited turning point has come? Yet the widely known activity and public statements of the candidate for people's deputies, the investigator T. Gdlyan, tell of the opposite. Whom should we believe? N. Bogachev, Moscow."*

This letter was the starting point for a discussion with USSR Deputy Prosecutor General A. F. Katusev.

[Katusev] There is nothing to hide: crime is continuing and, unfortunately, increasing. For example, during the first 2 months of this year as compared to the same period of last year it increased by 32.3 percent. Including by 79.1 percent for the number of robberies, 89.9 percent—thefts, 23.8 percent—rapes, and 27.4 percent—premeditated murders. And yet there were indeed 23.6 percent fewer cases of bribery revealed, and grand larceny committed through misappropriation, expenditures, and abuse of position—8.7 percent fewer.

Of course, a positive role was played here by the purposeful fight that is being waged by legal protection agencies against economic crimes which are considered to be especially important to the society and the economy. One can recall the widely publicized cases in Rostov-on-Don, Krasnodar, Moscow, and other regions where a significant blow was dealt to organized crime and corruption by the forces of the USSR Procurator and the USSR MVD and KGB. They are now completing an investigation of large-scale economic crimes in the system of the Ministry of Automotive Transportation in the Kazakh and Azerbaijan Union republics. And literally a couple of days ago, for example, they filed suit against 23 people who, operating at consumer service enterprises in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, caused damages to the state in the amount of 3.6 million rubles.

[Ovcharenko] But you know, Aleksandr Filippovich, judging from the letter from N. Bogachev with which we began our discussion, many people have the opinion that today it is mainly Gdlyan who is fighting against corruption and organized crime....

[Katusev] I shall not downplay the credit to Gdlyan and his brigade; I wish to note that the USSR Procurator has created a number of groups which investigate large criminal cases in many regions of the country. Moreover, as a rule, these groups are created not only from workers of the procurator's office but also from other legal protection agencies: the KGB and MVD. Recently, for example, I gave a guilty verdict for a criminal case concerning a theft of several million rubles in the Guzdal Firm in the Uzbek SSR. This case and others like it are the collective work of investigators and prosecutors as well as operators of the MVD and KGB.

And in general, economic crime today is so skillfully adapted to the new conditions of management, so technically well equipped, that it is simply impossible to fight against it through the forces of a legal protection agency alone, particularly the procurator's office. Therefore, naturally, we join forces with the MVD and the KGB, and also go to the Army for assistance. For example, in

order to confiscate and deliver stolen items in Uzbekistan, the Gdlyan group used helicopters, airplanes, and other military equipment. Entire Army subdivisions were borrowed for the investigation of criminal cases in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

[Ovcharenko] But still let us return to the economic crime statistics. Has the long-awaited change actually come here?

[Katusev] Alas.... The statistics register only what has been revealed. And according to certain data of legal scholars, the legal protection agencies discover only 5-10 percent of the economic crimes.

[Ovcharenko] Why so few?

[Katusev] There are many reasons. Of course, one can speak of the reduced aggressiveness of legal protection agencies. For example, during all of last year a number of investigation units of the procurator's office and internal affairs administrations did not bring to trial a single case of theft in especially large amounts or bribery. This kind of passivity and, in some cases, simple indifference to the protection of public property is typical not only of legal protection agencies. Manifestations of mismanagement, extravagance, and gross violations of state and financial discipline have not been eliminated from the activity of a number of ministries and departments and many enterprises and organizations. According to our data, last year the damage from this amounted to more than 4 billion rubles.

With the widespread thefts, mismanagement, and financial violations one encounters some paradoxical phenomena. A considerable amount of work is now being done to improve the structure of national economic management and make it less expensive. And strange as it may be, the reduction of ministries and departments in many cases proceeds through cutting back the control and inspection staff, which can lead to its elimination altogether. For example, in the system of the USSR Ministry of Trade there are now only 1,800 inspections instead of 3,700, although we are well aware of how bad the situation is in the branch. After all, in state and cooperative trade alone the sums of thefts discovered and charged to the guilty parties annually amount to no less than 200 million rubles. More than 1.2 billion rubles' worth of products and commodities are written off to natural losses.

Since I have already begun to speak about the control and inspection staff, I cannot but note another peculiarity: the low level of results. Just think—departmental inspections and checks reveal little more than 20 percent of the established thefts and shortages of material values.

[Ovcharenko] Aleksandr Filippovich, all this is true, but somehow we have gotten away from the role of legal protection agencies in the fight against economic crime. Does it not seem to you that workers of the procurator's office, workers in the fight against theft of socialist property and speculation, and the investigators are not completely prepared for working under the new economic conditions?

[Katusev] I do not deny that. Under the conditions of the development of the new economic policy we also need essential changes in the practice of applying the law. We should introduce and are introducing essential changes in the work of the investigators and arming them with new methods of investigating cases of economic and job-related crimes. But we cannot but note that essential changes in judicial practice and new definitions of the concept illegal have also had an effect on the quantitative indicators of the fight against theft and bribery. On 24 December 1987 the plenum of the USSR Supreme Soviet gave the courts new clarifications concerning the practice of examining cases of padding figures. They significantly change the approaches to declaring bonus payments to be thefts and they somewhat "decriminalize" the actions of the officials. Judicial practice has refrained from calling it wholesale theft when hired brigades are overpaid for work they have done. All this has undoubtedly also had an effect on the statistical indicators.

[Ovcharenko] In your opinion, do we need any additional legislative measures in order to increase the effectiveness of the fight against economic crime?

[Katusev] Undoubtedly. For it is no secret that many laws do not work and it is still easy for criminals to find loopholes in them for their own gain and for "washing" stolen money. For example, it is not stipulated that when registering a cooperative its organizers must submit a declaration of the money they are investing in the business or that they must indicate the sources from which they will acquire the raw and processed materials for their work. This has led to a situation where bribe takers and thieves frequently organize cooperatives whose initial capital is stolen from the state.

[Ovcharenko] Many readers note that legal protection agencies have recently been suffering from a kind of indecisiveness in the fight against crime. And they ask: Where does this syndrome come from?

[Katusev] As concerns the investigatory staff, one must note both objective and subjective aspects that are reflected in its activity in the fight against crime and bribery.

The solution to the problem of its reorganization has been drawn out too long. A good deal has been said and written about this but there have been no practical measures. The investigators, especially the prosecutors, have a certain lack of confidence in their future. Many of them, without waiting for reform, including improvement of their material situation, have begun to leave for the national economy and cooperatives, and I would say

they are finding better paid and less stressful work. And the best are being taken! During the last 5 years alone more than 4,000 people have left the procurator's office.

I cannot but mention one other thing. During the past 3 years there has been the strongest demand for observance of the law in preliminary investigations. And this is right. But frequently the policy is enforced only through disciplinary methods, without reinforcing them with any organizational-methodological measures. There have also been administrative excesses. As a result of this we have received the reverse effect: an overinsurance syndrome has appeared.

The disclosure and investigation of economic crimes around which organized crime is now grouped and increasing corruption—this is extremely complicated and frequently thankless work. But we have been doing it and we shall continue to.

Construction of Krasnodarskaya Atomic Plant Halted
18220075 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Mar 89 p 1

[Article by V. Zhilyakov (Krasnodar): "AES Construction Halted"]

[Text] The last worker left the construction site of the Krasnodarskaya Atomic Electric Power Station [AES] yesterday. This facility no longer exists. The village for 700 residents and the large industrial base constructed for it have been turned over to local enterprises.

Almost a year ago the bureau of the USSR Council of Ministers for the fuel and energy complex made a decision to halt the construction of the AES in Krasnodar Kray. Protests from the public and party and soviet agencies played no small role in this. It was intended to construct the station in the foothills of the Northern Caucasus where, as additional research showed, earthquakes are possible. But the seismicity of the chosen zone and the inadequate development of the entire complex of problems during planning did not stop the ministry. While the Kuban residents beat a path to the doors of the higher authorities, the builders managed to spend more than 20 million rubles on the construction of the AES. With this money it would have been possible to build more than ten modern multistory residential buildings....

But it is too soon to call this story closed. The problem of the shortage of electric energy in the kray is as critical as before.

It is assumed that along with the AES there would be a thermal electric power station, but no final decision has yet been made. During the period of the public outcry against the construction of the AES scientists and specialists made interesting suggestions concerning the organization of energy engineering in the Kuban. Attention should also be paid to them. For example, on the territory of the kray there is a multitude of rapidly flowing mountain rivers. Docent of Kuban State University Yu. Yefremov suggests resurrecting past traditions of small hydroelectric power stations. At one time in the Caucasus it was planned to construct entire cascades of small and mini-GES's [hydroelectic power stations]—on the waterfalls of rivers, alpine lakes with their rock dams, and water reservoirs in ravines between the mountains. But the proponents of megalomania won out.

No less interesting are the proposals of the initiators of the nontraditional energy engineering that is based on inexhaustible natural resources.

But in order to carry this out it is necessary to have assistance from the Ministry of Power and Electrification and decisive actions on the part of the kray leadership. But so far one gets the impression that, having halted the construction of the AES, the leadership and the public in the kray consider the matter ended.

Return of Koran Manuscript to Moslems Discussed
18300484 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 13, 29 Mar 89 p 12

[Interview With Mufti Mukhammadsadyk Mamayusupov by Murad Mukhammad Dost: "The Return of the Sacred Objects"; date and place of interview not given; first five paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] On 14-15 March, the IV Kurultay (congress) of Moslems of Central Asia and Kazakhstan took place, during which was elected a new council of spiritual directorate. Mufti Mukhammadsadyk Mamayusupov became chairman of the Presidium of the Spiritual Directorate of Moslems.

By resolution of the government of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], at the congress "Muskhaf Usmani," one of the oldest manuscripts of the Koran, was ceremoniously returned to the Moslems; it had been preserved in the Historical Museum of the Peoples of Uzbekistan.

"The return of the Koran is a great event," said the head of the Spiritual Directorate, Mukhamadsadyk Mamayusupov, "and not only for us, the Moslems of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, but to all adherents of the Islamic faith on the planet. 'Muskhaf' is a great monument of Moslem culture. We may assess the value of the manuscript by the fact that any publication of the Koran must have the words 'isna'da' (citation) 'This Koran corresponds precisely to the Usmani Koran.'

"As is well known, after the revelations of our prophet Mukhammad—a good prayer to him and all those who honestly follow in his path!—the sacred word of Allah was handed down orally. Individual verses were written inscribed on bones, date-palm bark, and pieces of skin, but a separate book did not exist. In the years of the rule of the first of the righteous caliphs, Abu Bakra, during a

time of sorrows called 'ridda,' there perished over 70 ka'ri, holy people who knew the Koran by heart. These circumstances hastened the course of events; the caliph ordered Zayd ibn Sabit to gather all of the chapters and verses together. Thus came about the first parchment copy of the Koran, in the form of disparate chapters. In the period under the rule of Caliph Usman ben a'Affan—25-35 years of Hegira (644-656 years by the Gregorian calendar)—Islam traveled well beyond the borders of the Arab countries. In the absence of a standard, variants of the Koran appeared which were strongly condemned at the time and are not in the least encouraged to this day. Caliph Usman gave the order to copy the Koran. Under the leadership of Zayd ibn Sabit and Abdulla ben Zubeyr, the best calligraphers created six copies absolutely identical copies of the Koran in Kufic writing, in the Bani-Kureysh dialect, of the tribe to which the Prophet Mukhammad himself belonged. The caliph sent two copies to the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, kept one for himself, and gave the rest to his subordinate wilayats.

According to one of the numerous versions, the 'Muskhaf' was brought to Samarkand from Sham by Emir Timur Kurgani. After Russian troops won Turkestan, a deed of title was made up, under which this priceless book was obtained literally for pennies and transported to Petersburg. After the October Revolution, V.I. Lenin gave the order to return the Moslems their sacred book. 'Muskhaf' was sent to Ufa, then Tashkent, in a special train car, with heavy security. It was preserved at our Spiritual Directorate for some time, but later it was requested by the museum on the basis of its value and the need for close protection from possible attempts to harm it. Since then, few have seen it, and those few, only with special permission."

[Mukhammad-Dost] Can you assert that the return of "Muskhaf" is a great gift to Moslems?

[Mamayusupov] Logic does not allow me to consider the Koran's return a gift, for we have received what has always belonged to us. Yet it would be sinful on my part to hide my own genuine joy, and that of many thousands of believers. This completed act is to me one more proof of the warming of relations between the state and religious organizations, proof of the the reality of restructuring and the long-awaited confirmation of the Leninist norms of leadership in our republic.

[Mukhammad-Dost] One last question, Mufti-Khazrat. You spoke of the enormous value of "Muskhaf." Can the Spiritual Directorate provide for its reliable preservation?

[Mamayusupov] You need not worry. For the very centuries-old history of the book convinces us of the correctness of the verse written in it: "It is impossible to destroy the Koran...."

[Mukhammad-Dost] But really?

[Mamayusupov] We have enough power and resources to protect "Muskhaf" as the eye in our head, as our personal honor and conscience.

Scientific

'Cosmos 2017' Satellite Launched 6 Apr

LD0704065289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0633 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—On 6 April 1989 a "Soyuz" rocket carrier was used to launch the latest artificial earth satellite: "Cosmos-2017."

Scientific equipment is on board the satellite, which will be used for continuing space research.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parameters:

initial period of revolution—89.7 minutes;
maximum distance from the surface of the earth (in apogee)—284 km;
minimum distance from the surface of the earth (in perigee)—244 km;
inclination of orbit—62.8 degrees.

Apart from scientific equipment, on the satellite are: a radio system for accurate measurement of elements of the orbit and a radiotelemetric system for conveying to earth data gathered by instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment on board the satellite is working normally.

A coordinating-computing center is processing incoming information.

Effort to Salvage 'Phobos' Mission Viewed

PM0604103989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 89 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Baberdin report: "The Riddles of the Martian Orbits"]

[Text] What has happened to the "Phobos" probe? Is there any hope that communications with it can be restored, that it will again fulfill commands from the earth and continue the exploration of the mysterious planet and its satellite? We have received many questions of this kind from the newspaper's readers lately. Our correspondent reports from the mission control center.

I am looking at a diagram depicting the flight path of the automatic interplanetary probe, which is lying on a desk in one of the offices at the mission control center. In the middle, Mars is pictured in red. And here is the orbit of

Phobos, the "red planet's" natural satellite. Slightly to the side and 371 km further out is the orbit of the man-made satellite. And all this is happening some 270 million km away.

We have reported how, initially, the space apparatus was placed in a provisional elliptical orbit around Mars, which was later corrected to become circular. Readers will remember how remote-control photographs were taken of Phobos and how a survey of the surface of the "red planet" was begun. The equipment and instruments were functioning normally, specialists at the mission control center were pleased with the quality of the photographs received from space. Many of them were unique. For instance, those taken with the help of the "Termoskan" [thermal scanning] instrument in the infra-red electromagnetic wave range. They enabled us to obtain an accurate, high-resolution picture of heat emanations on the surface of the Mars. No one had done this before.

Then came the most complex and crucial stage of the expedition—maximum approach to Phobos and depositing of instruments on its surface. A date for carrying out this operation had already been set. It was then that the unexpected happened. On 27 March the automatic interplanetary station failed to resume communications with the mission control center. This is how it happened.

The first daytime communications session lasted from 1125 through 1347 Moscow time. There were no problems. The operators were receiving telemetric information promptly from the spacecraft, feeding data into the onboard memory, and making radio checks of the orbit.

The next communications session began at 1559. Operations similar to those carried out on 25 March were planned—television filming of Phobos from a distance of 214-371 km and transmission of the image to the earth. The aim was to obtain information needed to gain a more accurate picture of the reciprocal positions of the probe and of Phobos itself, so as to set a time for the approach and select a site on the surface which could be safely overflown at an altitude of 50 meters. All this is done automatically in accordance with commands fed by mission control operators into the station's board control system in advance.

At the scheduled time when the filming of the Mars satellite began, the onboard transmitter was switched off and communications with the earth were suspended as planned. They were to resume when the filming was finished.

1859...1905...the "Phobos" probe remains silent. The mission control center control group swiftly analyzes the situation and takes prompt action to restore communications with the space probe....

2050...mission control picks up a signal from "Phobos," but after 13 minutes it disappears again....

To date communications with the probe have not been reestablished, although it is obviously still in orbit and its equipment and systems are functioning. What has happened? There are many hypotheses. It cannot be ruled out that for some reason, for instance as a result of being hit by a meteorite (whole showers of them are observed in the vicinity of Mars), the station has been disoriented and is spinning. Mission control specialists have worked out a number of options for restoring communications. However, there are many complications. It takes 30 minutes for a signal to reach the probe and return to earth. Furthermore, three times a day the "Phobos" probe is in the sun's shadow or in the radio shadow of Mars for up to 90 minutes at a time.

To analyze the situation in depth and examine the problems comprehensively, 12 special groups of engineers and scientists have been set up. They are drawing up recommendations and daily programs for the mission control group.

And now about the mysterious patch on the photograph of the Martian surface taken in the infra-red wave range, which was mentioned during one of the reportages on Central Television's "Vremya" program. It is now being carefully studied by astrophysicists and planetologists. Most probably it is the shadow of some space object (which can produce a sharp drop in temperature on the surface of the "red planet" like the one picked up by the probe's heat spectrometer). However, as to what object it is (the probe itself, or a natural satellite of Mars) is not yet clear. However, it is not very likely that this shadow is in any way connected with the loss of communications. That is the specialists' opinion as of now. Work is continuing at mission control center.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735,or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.